

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

# Bulletin

Vol. XLIII, No. 1106

September 5, 1960

## OAS CONDEMNS GOVERNMENT OF DOMINICAN REPUBLIC • Statements by Secretary Herter and Text of

## U.N. DISARMAMENT COMMISSION RECOMMENDS EARLIEST POSSIBLE CONTINUATION OF DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS • Statements by Am-

## SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERS NEW DIFFICUL-

## DEPARTMENT SUPPORTS REQUEST FOR AMEND-

CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY

SEP 19 1960

For index see inside back cover

D STATES

Y RECORD

DOCUMENTS SECTION X

## THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

## Bulletin

Vol. XLIII, No. 1106 . Publication 7061

September 5, 1960

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents U.S. Government Printing Office Washington 25, D.C.

> PRICE: 52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25 Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

OAS

Secretito attendination San Jose ments he charges to ican Reption passparture members

STATEM

I wish with my satisfact this universe the satisfact the shirt given us well-kno America to construct My destatemen meeting

eign min given fu appointe ezuelan ( ernment. impartia which th pared it brought

and the

conclusion founded.

basis for Dominica against t

These

Septemb

## OAS Condemns Government of Dominican Republic

Secretary Herter left Washington on August 15 to attend the Sixth and Seventh Meetings of Consultation of the American Foreign Ministers at San José, Costa Rica. Following are two statements he made at the Sixth Meeting, regarding charges brought by Venezuela against the Dominian Republic, together with the text of a resolution passed at that meeting, Mr. Herter's departure and arrival statements, and a list of the members of the U.S. delegation.

## STATEMENT OF AUGUST 18

Press release 473 dated August 19

7061

y

I wish, in the first place, to associate myself with my other colleagues in their expressions of stisfaction that we are holding our meetings in this universally admired country of Costa Rica. The shining example of freedom and democracy given us by Costa Rica and its people and their well-known devotion to the principles of inter-American cooperation are an important stimulus to constructive deliberations here.

My delegation has listened carefully to the statements which have been made before this meeting by the Foreign Ministers of Venezuela and the Dominican Republic and the other foreign ministers who have spoken. We have also given full study to the report of the committee appointed to investigate the charges of the Venezuelan Government against the Dominican Govemment. We are impressed by the thoroughness, impartiality, and high sense of responsibility with which the committee carried out its task and prepared its report. We find that the evidence brought out in the report is convincing and the conclusions arrived at by the committee are well founded. We believe, in short, that there is a firm basis for the finding that the Government of the Dominican Republic has engaged in grave acts against the sovereignty of Venezuela.

These acts merit the condemnation of this meet-

ing. They have created a situation within the scope of article 6 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, calling for the taking of appropriate action for the maintenance of peace and security in the hemisphere. The matter before this meeting of foreign ministers involves specific actions of one American Government against another American Government contrary to the principles that govern the relations of the American states as expressed in solemn treaty obligations. This Meeting of Consultation should clearly and unequivocally express condemnation of such conduct and take decisions which will give adequate expression to this opinion.

There is, moreover, Mr. Chairman, a larger responsibility facing the member governments of the Organization of American States. That is the responsibility for making clear that the Organization will effectively enforce the principles it has adopted and give full support to the maintenance of a system of law among the American states.

In the view of the United States, Mr. Chairman, this meeting is confronted with the solemn duty of insuring that principles of the Rio Treaty and of the charter of the Organization of American States, with respect to nonaggression and nonintervention, be not violated, especially when such violation would endanger the security of any American state. This meeting by its action should make unmistakably clear that the Organization of American States is effectively carrying out its purposes essential to the individual and collective security of our various Republics.

In addition to the developments referred to in the investigating committee's report, my delegation believes that an important aspect associated with the subject of this meeting is that discussed by the Inter-American Peace Committee in its report of June 6, 1960. The committee found that international tensions in the Caribbean area had been aggravated by "flagrant and widespread violations of human rights in the Dominican Republic" and stated that these tensions would continue to increase so long as these violations persisted.

The question now arises, Mr. Chairman, as to how best the ministers here present can formulate and adopt a constructive plan of action. There has been some sentiment here for the application of all the sanctions provided for in article 8 of the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro with the exception of the last one, namely, the use of armed force. Without entering into any debate over questions of whether such action would be affected by the provisions of the charter of the United Nations with respect to enforcement action by regional agencies, I wish to pose the question as to whether or not this is really the most effective means of achieving our aims.

First of all, let us be very clear as to our intent. The intent of this Meeting of Consultation is not alone to stop the type of action which I have condemned in my statement but also to create a situation within the Dominican Republic whereby that country can be brought back into respected membership in the American community and its citizens permitted to enjoy the benefits of representative democracy as set forth in the Declaration of Santiago. If this is our intent, is the application of sanctions at this time the best means of achieving this end? I have serious doubts.

My delegation feels that there is another approach which could constitute a practical means of preventing a recurrence of these acts that led to the calling of this consultative meeting. It might be called a preliminary approach, which might well offer a better opportunity. This is to recommend, with the full force of this meeting of foreign ministers, that the Dominican Republic agree to receive a special committee of this body in the Dominican Republic to assure that, within a specific and reasonable period of time, free elections by a people, who in fact shall have had the right of free expression and free assembly, be held under the supervision of the committee itself, subject to appropriate safeguards to assure observance of principles in conformity with the Declaration of Santiago. There are numerous precedents for the holding of elections under international supervision.

From the remarks made by some of the speakers who have preceded me, notably the distinguished

Minister of Argentina Diógenes Taboada], I am encouraged to think that this idea will receive a favorable response on the part of this meeting.

For the success of this proposal, it is essential that the powers of the committee—and they must be real-be clearly set forth and accepted. This is necessary to forestall any attempt to obstruct of water down the creation of the necessary conditions for genuinely free elections. Accordingly, if the proposal I am making commends itself to my colleagues, I would suggest that the resolution to be adopted at this meeting include a clear statement of the necessary powers, immunities, and rights essential to the proper functioning of the OAS supervisory committee. This statement would be included in the proposal to be given to the Dominican Government.

Should this offer be accepted by the Dominican Republic, this Meeting of Consultation will have the satisfaction of knowing that it has taken the best possible step to achieve its objective by orderly and peaceful change.

If, however, this offer should be refused, w should then consider what measures under article 8 of the Rio Treaty might be most effectively applied in order to bring about acceptance of this proposal by the Dominican Government. Sand tions in these circumstances would pass beyond the purely punitive stage and have a specific and constructive aim.

We are responsible representatives of responsi-under it ble countries in an organization which has responsibility for the whole of the Americas. It behooves us in this capacity to think soberly and deeply as to the decision and courses of action we adopt here It is our duty to our peoples and to the principles which animate this organization to try to assure that what we do here now will in the future turn out to be a constructive contribution to the peace liberty, and well-being of the peoples of the Americas.

## STATEMENT OF AUGUST 20

Press release 478 dated August 22

In voting in favor of the resolution that has tion was just been adopted, the United States has joined not mer with the other American Governments in con which demning the acts of intervention and aggression proposa against the Government of Venezuela which were

reakin interrul with ar The 1 my rem further had in express and agg get at th

carried

ment of

ioined i

continu in the Commit lishmen tion wit human : can pec

represer

the agg

Govern

Declara The I in addit vention the atter ask the pointme empowe sure the sembly addition

of the D Republi meeting Subse subject. ideas re committ abled t

necessar

Final

task.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For a provisional translation, see Bulletin of Sept. 7, 1959, p. 342.

carried out with the participation of the Government of the Dominican Republic. We have also joined in applying certain measures including the breaking of diplomatic relations and the partial interruption of economic relations in accordance with article 8 of the Rio Treaty.

iógene

his ide

part of

ssential

espon

eply a

nciple

h were

y must The United States was prepared, as I stated in . This my remarks to this meeting on August 18, to go on truct or further in achieving the real purpose that we have ditions had in mind here. That purpose was not only to , if the express our disapproval of the acts of intervention my coland aggression which had been carried out but to n to be get at the root of the matter in order to assure that tement the aggressive and interventionist policy of the rights Government of the Dominican Republic did not e OAS continue. That would involve, as was made clear ould be in the conclusions of the Inter-American Peace to the Committee in its report of June 6, 1960, the establishment in a peaceful and orderly way of a situaninican tion within the Dominican Republic under which Il have human rights would be respected and the Dominicen the can people permitted to enjoy the benefits of orderly representative democracy set forth in the Santiago Declaration. ed, we

The United States proposed on August 18 that, article in addition to the condemning of the acts of interely ap vention and aggression that had been brought to of this Sand the attention of the consultative meeting, we should bevond ask the Dominican Government to accept the appointment of a committee that would be fully fic and empowered to assure that free elections were held under its supervision. This committee would assponsisure the full right of free expression and free assembly by the people. It would establish such hoove additional appropriate safeguards as would be necessary to assure observance of the principles t here of the Declaration of Santiago. If the Dominican Republic did not accept this proposal at this very assure meeting, the sanctions would be applied. re turn

Subsequently, in the further discussion of this peace subject, the United States made known its specific of the ideas regarding the powers and duties of such a committee which, in our opinion, would have enabled the committee to achieve this important

Finally, if the Dominican Government did not accept such a proposal, the United States posiat has tion was that sanctions should then be considered joined not merely as punitive measures but as measures n con which would bring about the acceptance of the ression proposal regarding the aforementioned committee

and thereby achieve a constructive result. In view of the intimate relationship which is recognized to exist between the violations of human rights and the lack of representative democracy in the Dominican Republic and the international tensions which have culminated in the acts of intervention and aggression against the Government of Venezuela, any measures that the Organ of Consultation might take under the Rio Treaty could and should, we believe, be addressed to this basic aspect of the problem. Such collective measures would not, by definition of article 19 of the charter of the OAS, constitute a violation of article 15, namely, the nonintervention principle.

There is a growing and insistent demand on the part of the peoples of the American nations to achieve a greater respect for human rights and a more effective exercise of representative democracy. These goals must, of course, be achieved primarily by the action of the peoples of each When, however, a situation develops which, because of its flagrant and notorious character and its relationship to the maintenance of international peace and security, calls for action by the Organization, the transition to a representative democracy can, in the opinion of the United States, best be achieved by resorting to orderly and peaceful processes. We hope that our proposal may serve as a basis for future consideration of the question of how the Organization of American States may contribute to the achievement of this important purpose should the occasion arise. To sum up, the United States has been glad to associate itself with the majority opinion of the meeting because:

First, it condemns, as strongly as any nation here, the acts of the Dominican Government that prompted the convocation of this meeting.

Second, it believes, as strongly as any nation here, in the need to maintain the solidarity and common approach of our community. To do so it has been willing to adjust its views to achieve an acceptable solution.

Third, it is prepared to act, as strongly as any nation here, in supporting the decisions of this community.

It is now, Mr. Chairman, the task of the members of the Organization of American States to keep in close and intelligent touch with the situation created by the action of the Dominican Republic, exchange views frequently in the carrying out of our resolution, observe the effect of our decisions, and be ready to adopt new attitudes should the situation change, as indeed we hope it will.

## TEXT OF RESOLUTION'S

The Sixth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, having seen the report of the investigating committee appointed pursuant to the provisions of the third paragraph of the resolution approved by the Council of the Organization of American States on July 8, 1960, and,

### CONSIDERING:

That the Charter of the Organization of American States sets forth the principle that international order consists essentially of respect for the personality, sovereignty and independence of states, and the faithful fulfillment of obligations derived from treaties and other sources of international law;

That in connection with the incident denounced by the Government of Venezuela before the Inter-American Peace Committee on November 25, 1959, that organ of the Inter-American System reached the conclusion that "the necessary arrangements to carry out the flight from Ciudad Trujillo to Aruba—planned for the purpose of dropping leaflets over a Venezuelan city—and to load these leaflets in Ciudad Trujillo, could not have been carried out without the connivance of the Dominican authorities";

That the Committee of the Council of the Organization of American States acting provisionally as Organ of Consultation that was entrusted with the investigation of the acts denounced by the Government of Venezuela, reached the conclusion that the Government of the Dominican Republic issued diplomatic passports to be used by Venezuelans who participated in the military uprising that took place in April, 1960, in San Cristobal, Venezuela;

That the Committee of the Council of the Organization of American States acting provisionally as Organ of Consultation, which was charged with the investigation of the acts denounced by the Government of the Republic of Venezuela, also reached the conclusions that:

1. The attempt against the life of the President of Venezuela perpetrated on June 24, 1960, was part of a plot intended to overthrow the Government of that country.

2. The persons implicated in the aforementioned attempt and plot received moral support and material assistance from high officials of the Government of the Dominican Republic.

3. This assistance consisted principally of providing the persons implicated facilities to travel and to enter and reside in Dominican territory in connection with their subversive plans; of having facilitated the two flights of the plane of Venezuelan registry to and from the military air base of San Isidro, Dominican Republic; of providing arms for use in the coup against the Government of

Venezuela and the electronic device and the explosin which were used in the attempt; as well as of having instructed the person who caused the explosion in the operation of the electronic device of that explosive and a having demonstrated to him the destructive force of the same.

That the forementioned actions constitute acts of intervention and aggression against the Republic of Venezuela which affect the sovereignty of that state and endanger the peace of America, and that in the present case collective action is justified under the provisions of Article 11 of the Charter of the Organization of American States,

### RESOLVES .

To condemn emphatically the participation of the Gorenment of the Dominican Republic in the acts of aggresion and intervention against the state of Venezuela the culminated in the attempt on the life of the President of that country, and, as a consequence in accordance with the provisions of Articles 6 and 8 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

## AGREES:

1. To apply the following measures:

a. Breaking of diplomatic relations of all the memberstates with the Dominican Republic;

b. Partial interruption of economic relations of all the member states with the Dominican Republic beginning with the immediate suspension of trade in arms, as implements of war of every kind. The Council of the Organization of American States, in accordance with the circumstances and with due consideration for the constitutional or legal limitations of each and every one of the member states, shall study the feasibility and desirability of extending the suspension of trade with the Dominical Republic to other articles.

2. To authorize the Council of the Organization of American States to discontinue, by a two thirds affirmitive vote of its members, the measures adopted in the resolution, at such time as the Government of the Diminican Republic should cease to constitute a danger the peace and security of the hemisphere;

3. To authorize the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States to transmit to the Security Commoil of the United Nations full information concerning the measures agreed upon in this resolution.

## DEPARTURE STATEMENT, WASHINGTON, AUGUST 15

Press release 463 dated August 15

The Meetings of Consultation of the Americal Foreign Ministers which will begin Tuesday night in San José, Costa Rica, are of paramount importance. They are important not only to the Organization of American States and to the American Republics but to the rest of the world as well.

In San José the representatives of the American states will seek further ways by which a free community of nations can apply its fundamental rule

fully woof coop
We
strengt
found
and my
foreign
the her

of con

nental

to reaff lics in the inte

gravel

Press rel

and pr

my firmhave a expect.

It is ican S forther of force moffered mocrae

acted edeclari pressing ment of that al

have r

the att

preser ern H unite

peace ress wi

the Pr Jimén in Sar an adv democ nation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Adopted on Aug. 20 by a vote of 19 to 0; the Dominican Republic and Venezuela abstained.

of conduct and meet the threats of extracontinental intervention. The free world will hopefully watch for new confirmation of the strength of cooperation in freedom.

We of the Americas believe that the moral strength and the opportunity for progress to be found in the inter-American system are unique and must be protected. I am confident that the foreign ministers, recognizing that the welfare of the hemisphere and the ideals of its peoples are gravely threatened, will face these threats and act to reaffirm the solidarity of the American Republies in defense of the security and principles of the inter-American community.

## ARRIVAL STATEMENT, SAN JOSÉ, AUGUST 16

Press release 465 dated August 16

explosin

of having

on in th

ive and d

rce of th

s of inte

enezuel

endange

ase colle

Article 1

States,

the Go

of aggre-

uela the

esident

ance wit

America

membe

of all th

rms, an

il of th

with the

constitu

ne of the

sirabilit

ominica

ation (

affirms

l in thi

the Do

anger to

rganiza

nerical

y night

impor-

)rgani-

nerical

well.

I am most happy to be here in the beautiful and progressive Republic of Costa Rica. This is my first visit to your country, and from what I oeginnin have already been able to see of it I know that my expectations will be more than fulfilled.

It is most fitting that the Organization of American States has chosen Costa Rica for the two forthcoming Meetings of Consultation of ministers of foreign relations of the American Republics. For many years Costa Rica and its people have offered a splendid example of freedom and democracy at work. The people of the United States have not forgotten that in the grim hours after the attack on Pearl Harbor, in 1941, Costa Rica acted even more quickly than my own country in declaring the existence of a state of war, thus expressing its repudiation of aggression as an instruty Coun ncerning ment of policy. In this free atmosphere I think that all of us, as representatives of our respective governments, will be stirred to work harder to preserve the principles of democracy in the Western Hemisphere and to intensify the bonds that unite the American nations in seeking to achieve peace and security and economic and social progress with freedom for all their peoples.

I am looking forward with pleasure to meeting the President of the Republic, Don Mario Echandi Jiménez, whose invitation has made this meeting in San José possible and who is well known as an advocate and leader in the struggle to preserve nerical e com democratic institutions and live in peace with other al rule nations. I also look forward to working with my

colleague, the Foreign Minister of the Republic, Don Alfredo Vargas Fernández, and with the foreign ministers of the other American Republics.

## U.S. DELEGATION

The Department of State announced on August 11 (press release 451) that Secretary Herter is heading a U.S. delegation to San José, Costa Rica, for the Sixth and Seventh Meetings of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States. The Sixth Meeting will convene August 16. The Seventh Meeting will be convened at San José following the adjournment of the Sixth Meet-Composition of the U.S. delegation is as follows:

United States Member

Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State

Advisers

Andrew H. Berding, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs

Charles E. Bohlen, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State

Alex A. Cohen, Embassy of the United States of America, San José, Costa Rica

John C. Dreier, Ambassador, United States Representative on the Council of the Organization of American States

Edward A. Jamison, Director, Office of Inter-American Regional Political Affairs, Department of State

Roger Kirk, Staff Assistant in the Office of the Secretary of State

Robert H. Knight, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs

Earl H. Luboeansky, Office of Inter-American Regional Political Affairs, Department of State

Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs

Richard I. Phillips, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State

Robert J. Redington, Office of Inter-American Regional Political Affairs, Department of State

Henry C. Reed, Office of Inter-American Regional Po-

litical Affairs, Department of State Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for

Inter-American Affairs Marjorie M. Whiteman, Assistant Legal Adviser, Department of State

William A. Wieland, Director, Office of Caribbean and Mexican Affairs, Department of State

Whiting Willauer, Ambassador of the United States of America, San José, Costa Rica

Secretary of the Delegation

Donald B. Eddy, Office of International Conferences, Department of State

Staff Secretariat

James L. Carson, Executive Secretariat, Department of State

Frank A. Mau, Executive Secretariat, Department of State

## U.S. Calls Attention to Cuban Inconsistencies on Sugar Trade

Department Statement

Press release 476 dated August 19

With regard to the remarks made in a television appearance in Habana on August 14 by the Minister of Commerce of the Government of Cuba, Mr. Raúl Cepero Bonilla, the Department of State wishes to point out the most recent of the many disparities and inconsistencies which have characterized the official statements of the Government of Cuba concerning its sugar trade with the United States.<sup>1</sup>

On August 10 the Government of Cuba sent a note 2 stating that seizure of U.S.-owned property under Law No. 851, which the United States Government previously had protested as being discriminatory, arbitrary, and confiscatory, 3 was primarily justified as a means "to make amends to the nation for the economic damage inflicted upon it by the cut in its historic and moral rights in supplying sugar to the United States market."

However, the Minister of Commerce in his television appearance 4 days later stated that "for the coming year it would be more advantageous to Cuba if the United States did not purchase a single grain of sugar" from Cuba. He later reiterated this in saying, "I have observed that it would be to our advantage in 1961 if not a single ounce of sugar were sold in the United States."

The Government of the United States wishes to record its observation that this statement places the Government of Cuba officially on record as finding the quota reduction to be advantageous to that country and in essence constitutes a nullification of that part of the note regarding the just fication for the arbitrary seizure of property in Cuba owned by citizens of the United States.

It will be recalled that the Cuban quota in the U.S. sugar market was reduced to allow diversification of foreign suppliers as a means of protection to American consumers in view of Cubal long-range commitments to new purchasers such as Soviet Russia during a foreseeable period of probable decline in Cuban sugar production. It was explained at the time that the quota reduction was not a punitive measure.

The Government of the United States is gratified that the Government of Cuba, as demonstrated through the statements of its Minister of Commerce, is now in complete agreement that the measure will have no disadvantageous effects at the Cuban economy.

## Nuclear Test Negotiations Discussed With U.K.

Press release 462 dated August 15

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, John A. McCone, and the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Livingston T. Merchant, left for London on August 15 to discuss with the British Government the present status of the nuclear test negotiations in Geneva. It view of the wide range of proposals and counterproposals in the last several weeks in those negotiations, it seemed opportune to review with the British authorities the important unresolved is sues with a view to laying a common groundwork for the continuation of the conference.

## **Letters of Credence**

Spain

The newly appointed Ambassador of Spain Mariano de Yturralde y Orbegoso, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on August 19. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State presented as 470 dated August 19.

President of Pov

Fran
loss of
Follow
James
dent, an
News, a
partme

STATE!

imposed he depl nection May, an He ex

The l

of pros nothing tion. I compen detention provide

DEPAR'

In vie can Em resentar Affairs, to inter Herter [Andre Gromy]

son on June 13,

Not p

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For a statement by President Eisenhower on the reduction of the Cuban sugar quota and text of a proclamation, see Bulletin of July 25, 1960, p. 140.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Not printed.

 $<sup>^{8}</sup>$  For text of a U.S. note of July 16, see Bulletin of Aug. 1, 1960, p. 171.

## nullifica President Regrets Severity of Powers' Sentence

the justi

perty i

f Cuba

ers sud

eriod o

tion. 1

eduction

nstrate

of Com

hat this

fects or

cretar

C. Mer-

discus

statu

a. I

ounter

nego

th the

red is

dwork

Spain

ed his

1st 19

d the

pres

tes.

Francis Gary Powers was sentenced to 10 years' loss of liberty by a Soviet court on August 19. ta in the Following are statements made on that date by diversi James C. Hagerty, Press Secretary to the Presif protec dent, and Lincoln White, Director of the Office of News, Department of State, together with a Department statement of August 15 and the text of a Soviet note of August 11.

## is grad STATEMENT BY MR. HAGERTY, AUGUST 19

White House press release dated August 19

The President has been informed of the sentence imposed on Mr. Powers by the Soviet Court, and he deplores the Soviet propaganda activity in connection with the entire episode, beginning last May, and regrets the severity of the sentence.

He extends his sincere sympathy to the members of Mr. Powers' family.

## STATEMENT BY MR. WHITE, AUGUST 19

ommis The United States Government has no intention of prosecuting Francis Powers because it sees nothing in his conduct to warrant such prosecu-Provision has been made for continuing compensation for Francis Powers while he is under detention. Arrangements have also been made to provide for his wife.

## DEPARTMENT STATEMENT, AUGUST 15

Press release 461 dated August 15

In view of the continued inability of the American Embassy at Moscow, despite its repeated representations to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to arrange for an Embassy representative to interview Francis G. Powers, Secretary of State Herter addressed a letter to Foreign Minister [Andrei A.] Gromyko, which was handed to Mr. Gromyko by Ambassador [Llewellyn E.] Thompson on Friday, August 12. 2 The Secretary's letter

pointed out certain cases involving Soviet nationals which involved violations of U.S. espionage laws, as well as similar incidents in other countries, in which Soviet authorities demanded access to the individuals concerned and in which permission for such access was promptly granted. The Secretary's letter pointed out that further Soviet persistence in refusing to permit an Embassy official to visit Mr. Powers could only lead to the conclusion that there are certain aspects regarding the preparation of the trial of Mr. Powers which the Soviet Government, for its own purposes, desires to conceal.

The Soviet Foreign Minister's oral response to the Secretary's letter constituted a further refusal of the U.S. request for an Embassy representative to see Mr. Powers before the trial.

## SOVIET NOTE OF AUGUST 11

Press release 457 dated August 13

Following is the text of a note received from the Soviet Government in response to the American Embassy's note of July 30, 1960, about Francis Gary Powers.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics presents its compliments to the Embassy of the United States of America and with reference to the Embassy's note of July 30, 1960 has the honor to state the following:

As is known to the Embassy, criminal proceedings have been instituted against American citizen Francis Gary Powers under Article 2 of the Law on Criminal Responsibility for State Crimes (Espionage). F. Powers will be tried according to the laws of the Soviet Union. The Powers case has been accepted for consideration by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., open court session of which has been set for August 17. The competent Soviet organs consider it possible to solve the question of a meeting of an official of the U.S. Embassy with F. Powers at the end of F. Powers' trial.

Considering the circumstances of the case, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs declines the protest of the U.S. Embassy contained in the note of July 30 and expresses surprise at the form to which the Embassy resorted for expressing its requests to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.

As for the other questions presented in the U.S. Embassy's note of July 30, an answer to them was given in the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Foreign Affairs Note of August

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For background, see Bulletin of May 30, 1960, p. 851; June 13, 1960, p. 955; and Aug. 22, 1960, p. 276.

Not printed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> For text, see Bulletin of Aug. 22, 1960, p. 277.

## U.S. Urges Cessation of East German Military Activities in Berlin

Following is an exchange of notes between the United States and the Soviet Union concerning German military activities in Berlin. The U.S. note, which is identical to notes of France and the United Kingdom, was delivered by the American Embassy at Moscow to the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs on August 12.

## U.S. NOTE OF AUGUST 12

Press release 455 dated August 12

The Government of the United States has the honor to refer to the Soviet Government's note of June 30, 1960, which alleges that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is attempting to utilize the Western Sectors of Berlin for mili-

tary preparations.

The Government of the United States can confirm without hesitation that the recruiting of members of the Bundeswehr is not taking place in Berlin. Moreover, there is no conscription for the Bundeswehr in Berlin and no organizations which register individuals for military service. Furthermore, there are no organizations in Berlin which have the character of reserve units of the Bundeswehr and no Federal law subordinating the Berlin economy to the defense needs of the Federal Republic is being applied in Berlin. As there is no recruitment for the Bundeswehr in Berlin, there is no question of using Allied communications to transport contingents of recruits for the Bundeswehr from Berlin to the Federal Republic. Had such situations been found to exist in conflict with the special status of Berlin and with their own responsibilities for Berlin, the Allied authorities would, of course, have taken immediate steps to remedy them.

Such situations do, however, exist in the Soviet Sector of Berlin and the Government of the United States would like to believe that the Soviet Government now proposes to take measures to put an end to them. Moreover, the Government of the United States hopes that bellicose demonstrations by East German military and para-military forces, as for instance on May 1, 1960, in the Soviet Sector of Berlin, will cease. The United States, French and British authorities have frequently

had to call this problem to the attention of the Soviet authorities.

Any ordinances issued in Berlin pursuant to the Federal law on the Securing of Goods and Serices of the Industrial Economy, which is referred to in the Soviet Government's note, must be issued under the authority of the Berlin Senat. They would have no force or effect if they were contrary to existing laws, including Allied Control Council Law 43 which prohibits military production in Berlin.

The Government of the United States notes that a different situation now obtains in the Soviet Sector of Berlin, where Allied Control Council Law 43 is no longer respected. An ordinance on the "General Conditions for the Delivery to and the Provisioning of the Armed Forces of the German Democratic Republic" was published in the Soviet Sector on December 16, 1959.

The Soviet note not only makes unfounded charges regarding the violation of the special status of Berlin in the Western Sectors but also proceeds totally to disregard that status, in violation of the Soviet Union's pledged obligations, by asserting that Berlin is "on the territory of the German Democratic Republic." As the Government of the United States has frequently pointed out, the pertinent quadripartite agreements relating to the Allied occupation of Germany clearly confirm that the Greater Berlin area is not part of any zone and that by no thesis can Berlin be said to be "on the territory of the German Democratic Republic".

Assertions of "provocation" where none exist and assertions contrary to clear agreements already reached among the powers concerned only complicate the task of finding solutions to the outstanding problems which the United States, for its part, believes require diligent efforts of both sides to resolve.

## SOVIET NOTE OF JUNE 30 1

Unofficial translation

The Government of the U.S.S.R. considers it necessary to draw the attention of the Government of the United States of America to the following:

It has become known to the Soviet Government that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is

the Fede recruitme man Arn civilian i have been persons them into eations b known fo the tran sorts of a from amo pleted se tute in 1 Rerlin. Moreov Germany of West many. ( to West of the Fe charge V military In the the atter vocative Governm the terri was and eral Rep organs o that the not only sumes an characte It is er by the G to includ

attemptions. Of

measures
situation
the situa
more cor
rapid po
many an
in West
In con
expects t

declares,
Britain'
West Be
of the I
Berlin fo
ures for
part of

germany
Analog
ment to

Septem

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Delivered to the American Embassy at Moscow by the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs on July 1.

attempting to utilize West Berlin for its military preparations. On the territory of West Berlin, the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany are conducting active recruitment of residents of that city into the West German Army. In West Berlin a number of military and civilian institutions of the Federal Republic of Germany have been set up which are engaged in the registration of persons qualified for military service and in recruiting them into the Bundeswehr. At the same time communications between Berlin and West Germany, granted as is known for other purposes, are being illegally utilized for the transportation of recruited contingents. Different sorts of associations and "brotherhoods" are being formed from among those residents of West Berlin who have completed service in the West German Army, which constiinte in fact reserve units of the Bundeswehr in West

Moreover, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is even attempting to subordinate the economy of West Berlin into the interests of arming of West Germany. On January 8, 1960 a federal law was extended to West Berlin on the basis of which the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany assumes the right to charge West Berlin enterprises with the fulfillment of military orders.

of the

to the

Serv

ferred

issued

They

e con-

ontrol

roduc

es that

Soviet

ouncil

nce on

o and

e Ger-

in the

unded

pecial

t also

viola-

ns, by

of the

vern

inted

relat-

early

art of

said

eratic

exist

s al-

only

out-

, for

both

SSATT

nited

that

ny is

y the

letin

In the past the U.S.S.R. Government has already drawn the attention of the United States Government to provocative activity by the Federal Republic of Germany Government in relation to West Berlin, which is located on the territory of the German Democratic Republic, never was and is not included in the state territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, and cannot be governed by organs of the Federal Government. New facts indicate that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany not only has not ceased such activity but that this assumes an increasingly more dangerous and provocative character.

It is entirely evident that efforts being undertaken now by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to include West Berlin in the sphere of its militaristic measures only pursues the objective of heating up the situation even more in Berlin and Germany and bringing the situation to dangerous conflicts. All of this once more convincingly testifies to the necessity for the most rapid possible conclusion of the peace treaty with Germany and the normalization on this basis of the situation in West Berlin.

In connection with the above, the Soviet Government expects that the United States Government, which, as it declares, bears at the present time together with Great Britain and France responsibility for the situation in West Berlin, will put an end to efforts by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to utilize West Berlin for its military preparations and will take measares for the prevention of such illegal activity on the part of the Government of the Federal Republic of

Analogous notes have been sent by the Soviet Government to the Governments of Great Britain and France.

## U.S. Replies to Polish Note on German-Polish Border Question

Press release 453 dated August 11, for release August 12

Following is the text of the U.S. reply to a Polish note of July 20,1 which was handed to the Polish Chargé d'Affaires at Washington on Auqust 11, 1960.

The Secretary of State presents his compliments to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Polish People's Republic and has the honor to refer to the Polish Embassy's note of July 20, 1960, requesting the views of the Government of the United States regarding certain questions pertaining to the Federal Republic of Germany and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, particularly in connection with the settlement of the Polish-German border.

As the Polish Government is aware, the Heads of Government of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, when defining in Article VIII B of the Protocol of the Proceedings of the Berlin (Potsdam) Conference those former German territories which were to be under the administration of the Polish State, reaffirmed their opinion that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should await the peace settlement. The position of the Government of the United States on this matter remains unchanged. An obvious prerequisite for the peace settlement which will take into consideration the interests of all parties is the re-establishment of a representative and responsible German Government capable of negotiating and concluding a peace treaty on behalf of the entire German people and of assuring fulfillment of such a treaty. This is not only the view of the Government of the United States, but also that of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Federal Republic of Germany has never sought or obtained any assistance from its NATO allies in pressing territorial claims nor, in fact, is it pressing any. NATO is a purely defensive alliance whose members are fully and openly committed to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Na-

<sup>1</sup> Not printed.

tions. There are no mutual obligations among the NATO countries which are not a matter of

public knowledge.

Spokesmen for the Federal German Government, including Chancellor [Konrad] Adenauer, have repeatedly stated their conviction that force should not and will not be used in fixing the borders of a reunited Germany. A careful reading of the entire speech made by Chancellor Adenauer in Duesseldorf on July 10 confirms that Chancellor Adenauer continues to look to a solution of the border question only through the peaceful negotiation of a German peace settlement.

The Government of the United States can well understand the desire of the Polish People's Republic for a definitive solution of the border question, a desire which is shared by the German people. It seems clear, however, that this desire can only be satisfied when the obstacles to a peace settlement can be removed. The Polish Government is aware of the continuing efforts of the Government of the United States to overcome these obstacles and to prevent a prolongation of the division of Germany, which, by preventing a real peace settlement, continues indefinitely the uncertainty arising from the border arrangements made at Potsdam. It is the hope of the Government of the United States that all of the powers concerned will eventually realize the necessity of the reunification of Germany in peace and freedom. Only on this basis can a settlement be achieved and a basis established for normal and harmonious relations between Germany and all her neighbors.

## Secretary Announces Appointments to Advisory Committee on Arts

The Secretary of State announced on August 9 (press release 446) the appointment of Lillian Moore and Donald Mitchell Oenslager as members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts created by the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 (Public Law 860, 84th Congress). Miss Moore is a dancer and a member of the American Ballet Center. Mr. Oenslager is professor of scenic design, Department of Drama, Yale University.

## President Eisenhower Congratulates Prime Minister Ikeda of Japan

White House press release dated August 4

The White House on August 4 made public the following exchange of messages between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda of Japan.

## President Eisenhower to Prime Minister Ikeda

JULY 30, 1960.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: I extend my congratulations and best wishes on your election as Prime Minister. I look forward to working closely with your government on all matters of mutual interest and to strengthening the bonds that link our two countries in their dedication to the preservation of peace and human freedom.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

## Prime Minister Ikeda to President Eisenhower

AUGUST 3, 1960

I am most grateful for your cordial message of congratulations on my election as Prime Minister. I shall continue to work for the strengthening of the ties of friendship and cooperation between our two countries for the cause of world peace and prosperity.

HAYATO IKEDA

## U.S. Prepared To Assist Ghana in Volta River Project

Press release 468 dated August 18

K. A. Gbedemah, Minister of Finance of Ghana, has recently concluded a series of talks with officials of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Department of State, the Treasury Department, the Export-Import Bank, and the Development Loan Fund concerning the Volta River project—a major hydroelectric project which would produce power for the smelting of aluminum and for other industrial and private purposes.

The Government of Ghana has been informed that the U.S. Government is prepared to provide funds totaling \$30 million from U.S. sources to ward the financing of the Volta River project

posed a quired a tion is The line in assis gram or tion. The state of the control of the control

when th

factory

U.S. a Air Tr

tractive

tries as

investm

Govern

1958.1

The

Italy established the state of the state of

This aviation ington is a tartions ex

an arra

<sup>1</sup>Trea

when the Government of Ghana reaches a satisfactory arrangement with the owners of the proposed aluminum smelter and the financing required in addition to the possible U.S. participation is assured.

tes

lic th

esiden

eda o

960.

y con

ion as

orking

ers of

bonds

cion to

om.

WER

960

age o

nister

ing of

e and

EDA

hana.

h offi-

ection

e, the Bank,

g the

proj

lting

ivate

rmed

ovide

s to

oject

lletin

The U.S. Government has long been interested in assisting the Government of Ghana in its program of economic development and diversification. The Volta River project is an important aspect of Ghana's development program and a survey of the project's feasibility was jointly financed by the Government of Ghana and the Government of the United States. It is hoped that, when the Volta River project is completed, this new source of power will enhance the existing favorable climate for private foreign investment in Ghana. The Government of Ghana offers attractive tax-holding inducements to many industries as well as the added security provided by the investment guaranty agreement signed by the Government of the United States of America in 1958.1

## U.S. and Italy Amend Air Transport Agreement

Press release 429 dated August 4

The Department of State and the Embassy of Italy exchanged notes at Washington on August 4 amending the air transport services agreement between the two countries. Under the amendment Italy received the right to fly to Chicago via intermediate points en route to the United States and to extend its only previous route, which terminates at New York, to points in other countries which may be determined by the two Governments in the future. The United States received the right to serve Turin in addition to the other points in Italy, namely, Milan, Rome, and Naples, which have heretofore been served by its airlines. At the same time the two Governments formalized an arrangement to exchange air traffic statistics on operations under the bilateral agreement.

This action was taken as a result of the formal aviation consultations which took place in Washington in January and February of this year and is a tangible evidence of the cordial aviation relations existing between the two countries.

## Unethical Practices in Bringing Domestic Servants Into U.S. Deplored

Statement by John W. Hanes, Jr. Administrator of Security and Consular Affairs

Press release 436 dated August 8

Last week I sent Miss Alice C. Mahoney to Los Angeles to confer with local officials about an allegedly serious situation in the Los Angeles area involving the entry into the United States of domestic servants.

The Department of State was informed that a few unscrupulous employment agencies had been bringing domestic servants—primarily young girls—to the United States under highly questionable circumstances.

Miss Mahoney is one of the most experienced officers of the Visa Office and has had wide experience at our posts abroad, particularly with fraud situations. I wished Miss Mahoney to bring me a firsthand report based on her talks with the people in the Los Angeles area most involved with this situation. In handling such matters, the Department of State always works in closest cooperation with the local, State, and Federal representatives on the spot who have jurisdiction. At the same time we try to give full support, through our consular officers abroad, to their local efforts.

After conferring with Miss Mahoney, I have transmitted a special instruction to Foreign Service posts abroad directing consular officers to review with particular care all offers of employment to domestic servants being presented by intending immigrants. The consular officers have been instructed to withhold a visa in any case where it appears that the pay is insufficient to allow for a living wage, or where it is necessary for the applicant to work for several months virtually without salary to repay agency fees and other expenses, or in similar questionable circumstances.

If the Department of State learns that any agency or individual is engaged in any unethical practice in bringing domestics to this country, we intend to give every assistance to a full-scale investigation of such agency or individual through competent local, State, and Federal agencies with a view to criminal prosecution or other suitable corrective action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Treaties and Other International Acts Series 4121.

## President Amends Executive Order on Administration of P.L. 480

White House press release dated August 17

## WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President on August 17 amended Executive Order 10560 <sup>1</sup> to assign primary responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture for developing a long-range supply and dollar-credit program for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under the new title IV of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.<sup>2</sup>

Under title IV the U.S. Government may enter into agreements with the governments of friendly nations for delivery of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities for periods up to 10 years. Credit periods of up to 20 years are authorized. Payment will be in equal annual installments in dollars with interest. It is expected that the sales arrangements to be developed under this title will be based on shorter supply commitment and repayment periods.

(Executive Order 10560 was issued originally September 9, 1954, and assigned to various Government departments and agencies responsibilities for administering the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). Title IV was added to the act by the 86th Congress in 1959, and responsibilities are being delegated by the amended order.)

The Department of State will continue to perform the functions of negotiating and entering into agreements with friendly nations and will exercise foreign policy responsibility in carrying out the provisions of the act under the amended Executive order.

While care will be taken to avoid interfering with the markets of other friendly countries, the new long-range credit and supply provisions of title IV will strengthen our efforts to gain the broadest possible use of agricultural surpluses in our continuing overall food-for-peace program.<sup>3</sup> Underdeveloped countries will be able to obtain longer term supply commitments on a credit basis

for the purchase of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities for consumption during periods of economic development. The assurance of a food supply will permit these countries to mobilize their resources more effectively during their struggle to achieve industrial and other economic progress.

In addition initial discussions indicate that these new provisions may provide the means to open up new markets for certain farm goods and to maintain or expand U.S. dollar exports of surplus agricultural commodities through longer term commitments with other friendly countries.

Depai

Folle

retary.

Commi

Approp

STATE

Press rele

My r

quest fo

1. At

for a n

Americ

2. At

for fu

Republi

3. In

propria

addition

It is

seek ap

of the f

tional c

will be

permits.

I real

Herter

these pr

ther on

to quest

For ba

for an ex

<sup>2</sup> Secret

Committe

made by

Septemb

Exploratory discussions indicate that friendly nations are interested in using long-term credit to buy U.S. farm goods to be supplied over a period of years.

## **EXECUTIVE ORDER 10884**4

AMENDMENT OF EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 10560, PROVIDING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL TRADE DE-VELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code, and as President of the United States, it is ordered that Executive Order No. 10560 of September 9, 1954, as amended, providing for the administration of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, be, and it is hereby, further amended by deleting therefrom sections 1 and 5 and by inserting in lieu thereof the following sections 1 and 5, respectively:

"Section 1. Department of Agriculture. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this order, the functions conferred upon the President by Titles I and IV of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, are hereby delegated to the Secretary of Agricultura

"(b) The administration on behalf of the United States of the credit provisions of agreements entered into pursuant to Title IV of the Act (including the receiving of payments under agreements) shall be performed by such Federal agency or agencies as shall hereafter be designated therefor by the President.

"Sec. 5. Reservation of functions to the President. There are hereby reserved to the President the functions conferred upon him by section 108 of the Act (including that section as affected by section 406 of the Act), with respect to making reports to the Congress."

Deight Diem hour

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 17, 1960.

ugust 17, 1960.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 19 Fed. Reg. 5927; 3 CFR, 1954 Supp., p. 70.

<sup>\* 73</sup> Stat. 610

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For an interim report on the food-for-peace program, see Bulletin of Aug. 15, 1960, p. 248.

<sup>425</sup> Fed. Reg. 8019.

## Department Supports Request for Amendments to Mutual Security Act

Following are statements made by Under Secetary Dillon before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on August 15 and before the Senate Appropriations Committee on August 17.

STATEMENT OF AUGUST 15

Press release 459 dated August 15

com-

food bilize their

these

en up mainagri-

term

endly

dit to

eriod

NG FOR

DE DE-

ENDED

on 301

ent of er No.

or the

pment

it is

ions 1

ctions

ept as

ferred

ltural

mend-

ilture. States

o pur-

ing of

such

desig-

ident.

ctions

uding

with

lletin

My purpose this morning is to support the request for amendments of the Mutual Security Act to:

- 1. Authorize the appropriation of \$500 million for a new social development program in Latin America.<sup>1</sup>
- 2. Authorize the appropriation of \$100 million for further rehabilitation assistance to the Republic of Chile, and
- 3. Increase the existing authorization for appropriations of contingency funds by an additional \$100 million.

It is not the intention of the administration to seek appropriations during this session for either of the first two items, but appropriation of additional contingency funds is urgently needed and will be requested when authorization action permits.

I realize that you have heard from Secretary Herter the political considerations underlying these proposals.<sup>2</sup> I do not propose to dwell further on them, although I will be glad to respond to questions on this score.

First, I would like to describe briefly the proposed new social development program for Latin America as we envisage it.

## The General Concept

We have a special relationship with our Latin American neighbors. We are bound with them in unique and indissoluble ties of history, geography, and trade. In a political sense that special relationship has been developed over the years through the OAS [Organization of American States]. In many ways we have strengthened economic and financial relations among the American states. There is now a need to develop this special relationship in the field of social progress.

Latin America has the will and the ability to achieve the hemispheric ideal of economic development under free institutions. The new program we now propose is conceived as one to assist the Latin Americans to help themselves in achieving higher standards of life for all their people by cooperating in building the social institutions which are necessary to balanced development and the maintenance of political freedom.

In recent decades Latin America has made massive investments in basic facilities, which are prerequisite to industrialization and economic development in general. Industry has grown at a rapid, though not uniform, rate through much of the area. Agriculture has grown, though much less rapidly. But while there has been a steady rise in national incomes throughout the area, millions of underprivileged have not benefited thereby.

To Latin American economic growth the United States has made very important contributions in the form of both private and public capital. It is essential that we continue to help finance sound industrial development in Latin America in substantial amounts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>For background, see BULLETIN of Aug. 1, 1960, p. 166; for an excerpt from the President's message to Congress on Aug. 8, see *ibid.*, Aug. 29, 1960, p. 314.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Secretary Herter met with the Foreign Relations Committee in closed session on Aug. 11; for a statement made by him following the meeting, see *ibid.*, p. 316.

But more than this is needed if we are to achieve our objectives.

## The Specific Need

The progress achieved in Latin America has been impressive, but improvement in the standard of living of the great majority of the population has been disappointingly slow. There are various reasons for this.

In the first place the rate of population growth in Latin America is very high. This means that a substantial part of the annual increase in national product must go to feed more mouths.

Second, economic growth in Latin America started from a very low base so that even large percentage increases meant only relatively small gains in absolute terms.

Third, the distribution of national incomes in many countries has been far from equitable, with the bulk of the income going to a very small portion of the population.

Fourth, the low level of both general and technical education has severely limited the productivity of the average Latin American worker.

Finally, in some countries progress has been impeded by outdated economic, legal, and social institutions. There are great differences in this regard among the various countries. But where obsolete institutions exist, the result is not only to prevent the best utilization of the country's resources but to deny to a large part of the population an opportunity to share equitably in the growth of the national product.

The great majority of the people of Latin America still live in conditions of extreme poverty—a poverty which is reflected in every aspect of their daily lives. In some ways the very process of economic development has intensified the social problem. Rapid industrialization has attracted people on a mass scale to the cities, thereby creating new needs for housing, schools, hospitals, and other public facilities. Thus far, private and public resources have not been able to meet the social requirements of this trend toward urbanization.

Housing is a formidable and intractable urban problem. Literally millions of people in the large cities of Latin America are living in overcrowded and squalid slums, without running water and without the most elementary sanitary facilities. Most residential building, whether public or private, has been beyond the means of the great bulk

of the population. Water and sewage systems in poor the big cities have also been outgrown. There are few cities in Latin America that have sanitary water supplies meeting reasonable health standards.

Our purpose is not to finance public housingthe requirements of that are far too great. Our purpose is to stimulate the mobilization of private capital in the other American Republics through the means which have been so successful in this country, such as building and loan associations and similar credit institutions. Secondarily, we wish to encourage and assist the development of "aided self-help" housing, through which the governments assist in the acquisition of land, the prospective homeowner furnishes the labor, and we provide technical assistance and help the governments in financing the costs of materials.

While industry has grown, Latin America is still mainly agricultural. More than half of its labor force is engaged in agriculture. In some countries and for certain products agriculture is social well developed, but in most countries substandard mous living conditions characterize the great majority of the rural population. To improve living standards in the cities without doing so on the land merely increases migration to the cities and promotes new slums.

Latin American agriculture needs more adequate agricultural extension services, improved marketing organizations, and greater availability of farm credit.

Many countries still maintain land-tenure and land-taxation systems which date from colonial times and which frequently result in the underutilization or nonutilization of large areas of potentially productive land. These antiquated systems have led to a rising tide of demands for land reform.

I referred earlier to the low level of education and its effect on productivity. There is in particular a great scarcity of qualified industrial and agricultural technicians and of trained professional personnel in government. There is a need for more technical and vocational schools, and in existing schools there is a marked shortage of physical facilities and equipment, ranging from laboratories to workshops and textbooks.

This situation has all the unfortunate effects of a vicious circle. A lack of adequate social development is reflected in inadequate education

Th peopl ignor duced awak

But u

that .

fewer

ment.

result when condi existe hemis

It i

over : major must Ameri entire ageme

Our Pr Wh

ican f of the We r to attai

> ards fo quently develop hand. on us th us of th To the ahead r with yo coopera But wit tasks at

Becau initial c be not 1 tional a

be done.

poor health, and social unrest. This in turn restems in sults in lower productivity, which means that fewer resources are available for social better-

health Thirty or forty years ago the masses of the people in most of Latin America were sunk in usingignorance and apathy. Since then a wider awareit. Our ness of modern life in the "outside" world has proprivate duced a heightened social and political consciousthrough ness. Today the Latin American masses are in this awake. They intensely aspire to a better life. ons and But unfortunately most of them see little ahead we wish that offers them the hope of achieving it. The f "aided result is frustration and social unrest which governthreatens to erupt in violence and the overthrow prospecand destruction of existing institutions even we prowhen no good alternative is at hand. Surely such rnments conditions pose a serious threat to the continued existence of free democratic institutions in our erica is f of its hemisphere.

It is clear that a significant alleviation of the lture is social conditions I have described is a task of enortandard mous magnitude which will require large resources najority over a long period. It is equally clear that a g standmajor part of the burden involved in this effort must unavoidably fall on the countries of Latin nd pro-America themselves. But they cannot bear the entire burden. They need our help and encouragement.

### of farm **Our Proposal**

here are

sanitary

n some

he land

dequate

market-

ire and

colonial

under-

of po-

ed sys-

or land

ucation

partic-

ial and

profes-

a need

and in

age of

g from

Social

cation

What we would like to say to our Latin American friends, and for which we need the support of the Congress, is roughly as follows:

We recognize that if the peoples of Latin America are to attain the goal of higher material and cultural standards for which you are all striving, and which are eloquently set forth in Operation Pan America, social development and economic development must go hand in hand. Many of your progressive leaders have impressed on us the need for social overhead capital and have told us of the good uses to which they could and would put it. To the extent that you yourselves are willing to move ahead progressively in this field we would like to work with you and assist you. This must, of course, be a cooperative effort, and cooperation is a two-way street. But with your determination to address the problems and tasks at hand constructively, we know that the job can

Because of the magnitude of the need, we believe our effects initial contribution to this cooperative enterprise should be not less than \$500 million. We recognize that additional amounts will be required as progress is made.

We envisage these sums being used as rapidly as effective projects or programs can be developed. We have in mind assistance in such fields as land settlement and land utilization, housing, vocational, technical, and scientific training, and basic public facilities such as potable water systems and sewage systems.

Since you must finance your external needs for economic and industrial development primarily by borrowing and since many of you have difficulties in servicing outstanding foreign exchange loans, we envisage our contribution to programs for social development as being available in the form of loans on favorable terms including repayment in local currencies. Where it is appropriate and necessary, our contribution may be made on a grant basis.

This, in substance, is what we would like to be able to say to our Latin American friends at the forthcoming meeting at Bogotá. 3

## **Congressional Action Needed**

We do not ask for appropriations for this program at this time because we wish first to develop sound and specific program proposals in concert with our Latin American neighbors which will reflect a complementary relationship between our assistance and the efforts being made by our neighbors. We hope that a firm foundation for the development of coordinated programs can be laid at Bogotá. Since such programs will require strong actions by the Latin American countries, it is essential for progress that they be convinced that the United States really means business. That is the reason we are asking for an authorization which would be a concrete indication of our interest. An authorization would give us the necessary framework within which to develop the new program.

We would expect to use our funds through a variety of existing instrumentalities, the choice to be dictated by the circumstances prevailing. We expect that the Inter-American Development Bank will rapidly assume a leading role, hopefully the leading role, in administering the program. This institution, which is scheduled to open its doors on October 1, has the advantage of being an inter-American multilateral institution. We are confident that it will rapidly develop into an effective instrument for cooperative effort.

<sup>\*</sup> The Special Committee of the Council of the Organization of American States To Study Formulation of New Measures for Economic Development (Committee of 21) opened its third meeting at Bogotá on Sept. 5.

We also contemplate making greater use of the technical cooperation program of the ICA [International Cooperation Administration]. demonstration and training basis it has done a great deal to help people to help themselves and to assist governments to do so, but it has not had capital funds to help in financing the programs of agricultural, educational, and health improvement to which it has shown the way.

We would hope to include in the new social development program for Latin America the federation of The West Indies, which has achieved selfgovernment and which will soon become fully

independent—probably next year.

The timetable we contemplate looks to appropriations in the spring or summer of next year. In order to make a modest start in the meanwhile we intend to utilize the facilities of the DLF [Development Loan Fund to the extent possible. This makes it all the more important that the Congress appropriate the full \$700 million requested for the DLF rather than only the \$550 million contained in the House appropriations bill.

## The Proposal for Chile

I should like to turn now to the request for an authorization for \$100 million for use in the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Chile. This task of reconstruction, as the committee knows, is the result of the recent series of earthquakes and floods which left great destruction over wide areas of the most populous regions of the country.

According to the Chilean Government's latest estimates the cost of reconstruction will amount to approximately \$450 million. We assume that the largest part of this cost will be met by the Government and people of Chile themselves, but they cannot bear the entire cost and need generous help from outside sources. We have already provided emergency help in the form of approximately \$25 million in grants from contingency funds. An Eximbank reconstruction credit of \$10 million has been extended. We are also actively exploring the use of Public Law 480 [Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act] and of other authorities to help meet Chile's needs. In addition to assistance from other countries the Government of Chile has requested a loan of \$150 million from the United States. While a part of this need may be met through other means. I am

certain that Chile will need additional resources of ful review at least \$100 million in order to carry out its raconstruction and maintain financial stability.

Congo I

tion of c

and the

possible

ently r

Substan

time. T

a health

tential '

It is

econom

ress sho United

Congolo

achievi

within

aspire t

We expe

will wi

nations

Commu

precise

by the

Howev

Congo

vear 19

come c

authori

needs t

develop

For

additio

penden

tions w

often to

if serie

the peo

We mu

structi

if the n

I sir

Presid

essenti

in the

Mr.

that I

Your c

est in

For

Aug. 22

Septen

Authorization action now will provide the necessary reassurance to the Government of Chile that in undertaking the arduous and burdensome task of reconstruction, which will require substantial sacrifices by its people, and in adhering to its courageous program of economic stabilization, it can depend upon further and timely assistance from the United States.

## **Additional Contingency Funds**

The President has requested that the authorization for appropriations for contingency funds be increased by \$100 million. The need for this additional authorization and for the additional appropriations is real and it is urgent.

The events which have occurred in Africa since the enactment of the authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1961 confront us with a dramatically altered situation and a substantial increase in the needs to be met from contingency funds.

This is not to say that the need for some use of contingency funds to assist new nations in Africa was not envisaged prior to the recent events. For example, we did foresee a need in the Congo, and that need might have been met within the original authorization. What we did not foresee was that the transition from colony to independent state would be accompanied by the violence we have witnessed and the disruption of relationships between Belgium and the Congo with such adverse effects on the interests of both countries.4 The new Congo Republic needs help urgently to restore some of the fundamental conditions that will permit a more normal life to be resumed. Administrators and technicians must be trained. Minimum social services must be resumed. Transportation must become available once more, and telephones, telegraph stations, and the mails must operate throughout the country. Essential banking and other services to the business community must be performed. It is our earnest hope that stability may be restored in this troubled area and the energies of its peoples and of the United Nations may be turned to the tasks of redirecting its economy into a path of peaceful progress.

Despite the uncertainty of the situation, a care-

Department of State Bulletin

<sup>&#</sup>x27;For background, see Bulletin of Aug. 8, 1960, p. 221.

arces of ful review of the present economic situation in the Congo makes unmistakably clear that the restoration of order, the resumption of economic activity, and the conduct of government will be totally impossible within the resources which can be presently mustered by the Congolese internally. Substantial outside help will be essential for some time. The Congo has a real potential for achieving a healthy economy, but the realization of this potential will be possible only if aid is forthcoming.

its re

le that

ne task tantial

to its

tion, it

istance

thori-

funds

or this

tional

since

n for

ically

in the

use of

frica

For

, and

ginal

that

state

have

s be-

verse

The

o re-

will

Ad-

ined.

ans-

and

nust

ank-

nity

that

and

Na-

its

are-

21.

etin

y. neces-

> It is our view that the problems of achieving economic order and starting on the road to progress should be dealt with through the offices of the United Nations. We wish it to be clear to the Congolese that we are willing to help them in achieving stability and a start toward progress within free Congolese institutions and do not aspire to control or direct their affairs. Certainly we expect and believe that other free-world nations will wish to assist in the same way. Still other nations will offer to assist with a view to securing Communist control. It is too early to know what precise dimension or form of help will be needed by the Congo and what our fair share may be. However, it is very possible that the needs in the Congo together with the \$20 million grant of fiscal year 1961 funds for Chilean reconstruction could come close to exhausting the present contingency authorization, leaving little or nothing for the needs that experience has taught us will surely develop elsewhere.

For instance, during the present year some 16 additional African nations will gain their independence.5 It is our earnest hope that the transitions will be made peacefully, but in this vast and often troubled continent it would not be surprising if serious problems arose beyond the capacity of the peoples immediately concerned to resolve alone. We must be in a position to take prompt and constructive action in concert with other free nations if the need arises.

I sincerely urge that favorable action on the President's request be promptly taken. It is an essential element in assuring our nation's interest in the uncertain days that lie ahead.

Mr. Chairman, there is one additional matter that I would like to put before you at this time. Your committee has frequently expressed its interest in providing adequate flexibility in the con-

duct of the Mutual Security Program and invited suggestions for removal of any restrictive provisions which impair efficient operations.

We are confronted at this time with a situation which in our opinion gives to section 551 of the Mutual Security Act, at least in part, a restrictive character which may well impede an effective response to the emerging situations with which we are likely to be confronted during the present fiscal year.

That section, as the committee will remember, was enacted at its suggestion and was quite properly intended to prevent undue augmentation of various administrative expense accounts by use of either the transfer authority of the President under section 501 of the act or by use of the contingency funds. While we do not quarrel with the basic purpose sought by this committee in adopting this provision and believe that under normal circumstances it does not seriously interfere with efficient administration, we do believe that in the particular situation we now face it will have this effect.

Authorization and appropriation requests for administrative expenses under sections 411(b) and 411(c) were formulated some months ago, in advance of both the recent congressional action increasing pay scales for Government employees and the unforeseen acceleration of demands for assistance to meet the troublesome political and economic situations in Africa. The action taken by the House Appropriations Committee has reduced the amounts originally requested rather substantially. This action was also taken in advance of the pay legislation and the African developments. While we are hopeful that the Senate Appropriations Committee will report an appropriations bill which may have the ultimate effect of alleviating the administrative fund situation somewhat, it is not possible within the existing authorization to obtain adequate funds to cover both the pay legislation and necessary administrative expenses for the institution and execution of new programs in the African Continent which the rapidly developing situation is likely to require.

I have discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget and have obtained the agreement of the Director of the Bureau that we suggest to you the desirability of obtaining a modification of the authorizing legislation which would have

For a list of the political divisions of Africa, see ibid., Aug. 22, 1960, p. 283.

the effect of suspending the application of the restrictive injunction in section 551 insofar as it applies to sections 411(b) and 411(c) for the duration of this fiscal year. We are not suggesting the deletion of this provision from the law but rather a measure of temporary relief. If such action is looked upon with favor by the committee, we believe that drafting of the necessary language can be quickly accomplished.

## STATEMENT OF AUGUST 17

Press release 469 dated August 17

The President in his message to the Congress of August 8 requested that there be provided at this session an additional authorization and appropriation for mutual security contingency funds in the amount of \$100 million. We believe that this additional authorization and additional appropriation is urgently needed at this session.

Day before yesterday I appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee requesting that it take the most rapid action reasonably possible to obtain the authorizing legislation. Yesterday morning that committee approved this authorization. I should like to explain to you why we feel so urgently the need for an appropriation to be added to the mutual security bill now before your committee.

You will recall that the executive branch originally requested \$175 million for the contingency fund. The Congress authorized \$150 million, and this sum was recommended by the House in the appropriation bill before you. The \$175 million originally requested by the executive branch was thought by us to be barely adequate to meet contingency needs which could be foreseen at the time our program was prepared nearly a year ago and to meet the kinds of emergencies which our experience over the last several years had indicated to us would inevitably arise. Now, however, in the short space since I last met with you, the events which have occurred in Africa confront us with a situation which has dramatically altered our anticipation as to the adequacies of the present contingency fund and has shown all too plainly that a substantial increase in it is essential if the national interest of the United States in

this turbulent area and in other danger areas of the world is to be supported.

## Situation in the Congo

I would not want to imply that we did not foresee prior to the recent events the need for some contingency funds to assist nations in Africa, We did, for example, foresee such a need for help to the Congo and anticipated that it might be met within the contingency fund originally requested. However, we were not able to foresee the violence and extreme disruption of established organizations which has occurred with such adverse effect on the civil administration and the economy of the new nation. The disorders of the past month have understandably resulted in the departure of large numbers of the skilled Belgians who had been key people in the administration of the Government and in the management of the public utilities, businesses, mines, plantations, and other enterprises on which the economy of the Congo depends.

It is all too apparent now that the new Congo Republic is urgently in need of immediate and substantial help to restore the most fundamental activities of the Government and of commerce to permit the resumption of even an approximation of normal life.

We believe that the United Nations is the proper channel through which to attack the problems of bringing about economic order in the Congo and setting that nation again on the road to progress. We cannot yet determine exactly how much help will be required or in what form precisely it will be needed, but it is highly important that we indicate at once our readiness to contribute our share to the work of the United Nations in assisting the Congolese to reestablish themselves on the way toward peaceful development.

This could be a job of substantial magnitude. It will be necessary to train technicians and administrators and to meet minimum requirements for social services and the furnishing of public utilities.

Transportation must be reestablished. The telephones and telegraphs must be put back in working order, and the mails which have left thousands of letters piled up undelivered must be put back in operation. The country cannot operate without essential services to the business community

Ther
it is clifully n
establis
conduct
the Co
have a
essentiatime.
achieve

it cann

lish its

such a

enterpi

We de all poss nations effort to less fro that the stantia.

We with a session proprie fund i to span

Urgent

In fact \$100 m tially a made a and in The crease

quested million repeat priatio I and previou last ap cated is with re-

Septem

spect t

provisi

<sup>\*</sup>Mr. Dillon testified in his capacity as Acting Secretary of State.

the Ho

reas of such as banking and the management of basic

> There are many unknowns in this situation but it is clear from the analysis which we have carefully made that the restoration of order, the reastablishment of economic life, and the orderly conduct of government cannot be carried out by the Congolese themselves with the resources they have available. Substantial outside help will be assential and will be needed for some period of time. We believe that the Congo will be able to schieve a healthy economy, but it is certain that it cannot do so without assistance now to reestablish itself on the road toward progress from which it was diverted by the recent disorders.

> We expect that the United Nations will make all possible efforts to obtain contributions by other nations capable of contributing to the common effort to assist the people of the Congo. Nevertheless from the dimensions of the problem we know that the United Nations may require very sub-

stantial sums from us.

t fore-

a. We

nelp to

be met

uested.

iolence

aniza-

effect

of the

h have

large

been

overn-

utili-

other

Congo

Congo

e and

nental

rce to

nation

roper

ms of

o and

gress.

help

t will

indi-

share

g the

way

e. It

ainis-

s for

ublic

tele-

vork-

sands

back

with-

unity

lietin

## **Urgent Need for Full Appropriations**

We would not now be asking the Congresswith all the heavy pressures on it at this short session—for an additional authorization and appropriation of \$100 million for the contingency fund if we thought there would be any money to spare from the appropriations already asked. In fact it is possible to limit this new request to \$100 million only on the assumption that substantially all the appropriations now before you will be made available by your committee, by the Senate, and in the final conference with the House.

The effect of this request is, of course, to increase the total amount of appropriations requested under the Mutual Security Act by \$100 million. It is not my intention at this time to repeat the testimony regarding need for appropriations for the Mutual Security Program which I and other administration representatives have previously presented to this committee. In my last appearance before you, on June 28th, I indicated in some detail the administration's views with respect to the need for funds and with respect to the need for modification in the specific provisions of the appropriations act passed by the House of Representatives.

Suffice it to say at this time that the events which have occurred during the weeks since I appeared before you only serve to accentuate the urgent need for full appropriation of the amounts requested.

The current situation in Africa strikingly demonstrates the necessity of appropriating the full amount authorized for special assistance. It is this account which provides the funds for programs of economic assistance to Africa. Without the full appropriation anything approaching an adequate response to the requirements of this area will be extremely difficult.

Requirements for technical assistance programs in Africa are also sure to mount as a result of many African nations' achieving independence more rapidly than has been anticipated.

The belligerent and provocative attitude of the Soviet Union in its numerous threatening utterances underscores the importance of adequate defense support appropriations to assure maintenance of adequate defensive forces in our allied nations.

The need for an immediate start on the problems of social development in Latin America makes it all the more important that the full \$700 million requested for the DLF be provided.

In essence it is in the common national interest to demonstrate clearly that even during moments of great domestic political contest our nation stands united in its firm determination to resist the expansion of aggressive communism and to offer a helping hand to the less fortunate peoples of the world.

## **Congressional Documents** Relating to Foreign Policy

## 86th Congress, 1st Session

The U.S. Government and the Future of International Medical Research. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. ternational Health Study, pursuant to S. Res. 347, 85th Cong., S. Res. 42, and S. Res. 255, 86th Cong. Part I (includes transcript of conferences in Europe, November-December 1958). July 9 and 16, 1959. Communist Threat to the United States Through the

Hearing before the Subcommittee To In-Caribbean. vestigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Part V. Testimony of Hon. Spruille Braden. July 17, 1959. 62 pp.

BULLETIN of July 18, 1960, p. 109.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

## Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings 1

Adjourned During August 1960 In Session as of August 31, 1960

Lists of meetings adjourned and those currently in session now appear in the third issue of the Bulletin each month.

## Scheduled September 1 Through November 30, 1960

5th Round of GATT Tariff Negotiations.  GATT Tariff Negotiations Committee  Ad Hoc Committee of U.N. General Assembly To Consider General  Questions of Transmission of Information.	Geneva Sept. 1- Geneva Sept. 1- New York Sept. 2-
Information Officers of Colombo Plan Countries: 2d Conference. International Lead and Zinc Study Group: 2d Session	Bangkok Sept. 5-Geneva Sept. 5-Bogotá Sept. 5-
U.N. ECE Working Party on Mechanization of Agriculture	Geneva         Sept. 5-           London         Sept. 5-           Montreal         Sept. 6-           Tehran         Sept. 12-           Geneva         Sept. 12-           Buenos Aires         Sept. 12-           New York         Sept. 12-           Washington         Sept. 12-
IAEA Board of Governors: 18th Session	Vienna       Sept. 13-         London       Sept. 13-         México, D.F.       Sept. 14-         Maracay, Venezuela       Sept. 15-         Katmandu, Nepal       Sept. 15-
International Council for the Exploration of the Sea: 48th Meeting . International Rubber Study Group: 15th Meeting . GATT Council of Representatives . U.N. ECE Coal Committee: 51st Session . IAEA General Conference: 4th Regular Session . U.N. General Assembly: 15th Session . International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, and International Finance Corporation: Annual Meetings of Boards of Governors.	Moscow.         Sept. 19-           Kuala Lumpur, Malaya         Sept. 19-           Geneva.         Sept. 19-           Geneva.         Sept. 19-           Vienna.         Sept. 20-           New York         Sept. 20-           Washington.         Sept. 26-
ILO Ad Hoc Meeting on Civil Aviation	Geneva Sept. 26-Washington Sept. 26-
WMO Regional Association VI (Europe): 3d Session GATT Committee III on Expansion of International Trade U.N. ECE Conference of European Statisticians: 8th Session U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Economic Development and Planning: 6th Session.	Madrid.       Sept. 26—         Geneva.       Sept. 26—         Geneva.       Sept. 26—         Bangkok       Sept. 27—
Interparliamentary Union: 49th Conference	Tokyo Sept. 29– Geneva September
GATT Article XXII Consultations With Italy	Geneva September Geneva September Washington Oct. 3-

¹ Prepared in the Office of International Conferences, Aug. 18, 1960. Following is a list of abbreviations: CCIR, Comité consultatif international des radio communications; CCITT, Comité consultatif international télégraphique et téléphonique; COAS, Council of the Organization of American States; ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; IAEA, International Atomic Energy Agency; IA-ECOSOC, Inter-American Economic and Social Council; ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; ICEM, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; ILO, International Labor Organization; IMCO, Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization; ITU, International Telecommunication Union; OAS, Organization of American States; U.N., United Nations; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; UNICEF, United Nations Children's Fund; WHO, World Health Organization; WMO, World Meteorological Organization.

Calend

GATT C U.N. EC U.N. EC Internati The Hay sion. Executiv

sioner

Inter-An

mittee Internat bly. FAO Re U.N. EC U.N. EC on Sta IAEA Sy Liquid

10th Par

South P

U.N. Sp FAO Co GATT I ECAFE U.N. EC ICAO A FAO Te Internat ILO Per Inter-Ar mittee WHO E Consulta in Sou Offi Mir GATT ( Inter-Ar mittee FAO Ad FAO Gr Pan Am Assem

IMCO S ment. 10th U.1 UNESC FAO/OA North 1st FAO ILO Int lation: UNESC

9th 6th 5th IA-ECC Meeti

ILO God FAO Indinternat FAO Inding Ad U.N. E Sessio

U.N. Sc ICAO V 6th Mee UNESC 5th FAC

Septem

## Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings—Continued

## Scheduled September 1 Through November 30, 1960-Continued

- 1			
	GATT Committee II on Expansion of International Trade U.N. ECE Electric Power Committee	Geneva	Oct. 3- Oct. 3- Oct. 3- Oct. 4- Oct. 5-
	sion. Executive Committee of the Program of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees: 4th Session.	Geneva	Oct. 5-
0	Inter-American Travel Congresses: 3d Meeting of Technical Committee of Experts on Tourist Travel Promotion.	México, D.F	Oct. 6-
	International Criminal Police Organization: 29th General Assembly.	Washington	Oct. 10-
	RÃO Regional Conference for Europe: 12th Session	Rome	Oct. 10- Oct. 10- Oct. 11-
	IAEA Symposium on Inelastic Scattering of Neutrons in Solids and Liquids.	Vienna	Oct. 11-
	International General Conference on Weights and Measures 10th Pan American Railway Congress	Paris	Oct. 11- Oct. 12- Oct. 20- Oct. 27-
	South Pacific Commission: 21st Session	New York	Oct. 13- Oct. 13- Oct. 17-
	FAO Council: 34th Session GATT Balance-of-Payments Consultations	Rome	Oct. 17- Oct. 17-
	ECAFE/FAO Far East Pulp and Paper Conference	Tokyo	Oct. 17- Oct. 18-
	ICAO Airworthiness Committee: 4th Session FAO Technical Meeting on Coffee Production The Production Committee Commit	Montreal	Oct. 20- Oct. 24-
	International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: 7th Meeting .  ILO Permanent Agriculture Committee	Vancouver	Oct. 24- Oct. 24-
	mittee of Experts on Removal of Travel Barriers.  WHO Executive Board: 26th Session	Geneva	Oct. 25-
	in South and Southeast Asia ("Colombo Plan"): 12th Meeting: Officials Meeting	Tokyo	Oct. 31-
	Ministerial Meeting	Tokyo	Nov. 14- Oct. 31-
	Inter-American Travel Congresses: Permanent Executive Committee.	Buenos Aires	Oct. 31-
	FAO Advisory Campaign Committee on Freedom From Hunger. FAO Group on Cocoa: Executive and Statistical Committees Pan American Institute of Geography and History: 7th General Assembly:	Rome	October October
	9th Pan American Consultation on Cartography 6th Pan American Consultation on Geography	Lima	October October
	5th Pan American Consultation on History	Lima	October October
	MCO Subcommittee on Unification of Maritime Tonnage Measurement.	London	October
	10th U.N. Technical Assistance Conference	New York	October October
	FAO/OAS/ILO Technical Meeting on Rural Cooperatives for the Northern Zone of Latin America.	San Juan	Nov. 1-
	lst FAO Regional Conference for Africa	Lagos, Nigeria	Nov. 3- Nov. 3-
1	UNESCO Executive Board: 57th Session	Paris	Nov. 7- Nov. 8-
	FAU International Rice Commission: 7th Session	Saigon	Nov. 9- Nov. 9-
-	International Wheat Council: 31st Session.  FAO International Rice Commission: Working Party on Engineering Aspects of Rice Production, Storage, and Processing.	Saïgon	Nov. 10-
Section 1	U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Customs Administration: 2d Session.	Bangkok	Nov. 10-
-	U.N. Scientific Advisory Committee. ICAO Visual Aids Panel: 1st Meeting 6th Meeting of Experts of American Central Banks	Montreal	Nov. 11- Nov. 14-
The second	Unesco General Conference: 11th Session	Guatemala	Nov. 14- Nov. 14-
1	5th FAO Regional Conference for Asia and the Far East	Salgon	Nov. 21-

lletin September 5, 1960

CCIR, que et and the ement Social Migra-ITU, ESCO, WHO,

n now

ILO Asian Advisory Committee: 10th Session	Geneva Nov. 21-
ICEM Executive Committee: 16th Session	Geneva Nov. 21-
ITU CCITT: 2d Plenary Assembly	New Delhi Nov. 21-
U.N. ECE Working Party on Steel Statistics and Ad Hoc Meetings	Geneva Nov. 21-
of Experts on Productivity and Automation.	
U.N. ECAFE Working Party on Housing and Building Materials:	Bangkok Nov. 22-
6th Meeting.	
U.N. ECE Committee on Agricultural Problems: 12th Session	
U.N. ECAFE Inland Transport and Communications Committee:	Bangkok November
Ad Hoc Working Party on Classification of Inland Waterways.	

## U.N. Disarmament Commission Recommends Earliest Possible Continuation of Disarmament Negotiations

Following are statements made by Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, in the U.N. Disarmament Commission on August 16, 17, and 18, together with the text of a resolution adopted unanimously by the Commission on August 18 and a five-power report transmitted to the Commission on August 12.

## STATEMENT OF AUGUST 16

U.S./U.N. press release 3457

The United States appreciates the willingness of the members of the Disarmament Commission to hold this meeting at the request of the United States.<sup>1</sup>

There should, we think, be no misunderstanding as to why the United States requested this meeting. We very much want negotiations on disarmament to resume. But we do not call this meeting for the purpose of conducting negotiations on disarmament here and now in this Commission. The United States knows that the Soviet Union has said that it does not wish to negotiate at present. There were no successful negotiations at Geneva, and, unless the Soviet attitude changes, there will be no negotiations either here in the Disarmament Commission or next month in the General Assembly.

Why, then, did the United States ask for this meeting? For several reasons: It is because we thought the Commission had a right to be informed about the Geneva talks, and it is because

we wanted to present our case to the United Nations and to world opinion. We wanted also to present it to the Soviet Union.

est se could have delay. this C the tall Nov say as The them

on the

It is omember the member of th

ments

and ag

propo

As yo

is enti

Histor

Mr.

long a

this v

menta

of an

on tru

ples, b

sion a

people

ficial :

tacula

quest,

but o

growt

spired

is bot

the w

ment

reach

only a

Septe

The

We

An

We

We

We

We

On June 27 the United States Representative at Geneva [Fredrick M. Eaton] was about to present the new United States position. At this point the Soviet Union walked out of the meeting. There were members then who thought at that time that we should have a meeting of this Commission. The Secretary-General thought that such a meeting was inadvisable at that time. We agreed, and we believed that we should make an appeal by ourselves to the Soviet Union before resorting to the Commission. We did this on July 2,3 but our overture did not bring a resumption of talks.

We think we have a good proposal, Mr. Chairman. What I am going to say today not only restates the proposal which we made at Geneva but it adds something to it which we think is very significant. We do not, of course, insist that the Soviet Union must agree to this; but we do think that the Soviet Union ought to hear it.

We also think that world opinion ought to hear it and ought to hear it in a forum like this, which is devoted exclusively to disarmament, and not merely hear it in the General Assembly, where it is only one of more than 80 other issues.

Now those are some of the reasons why we called this meeting. But finally—the final reason for which the United States called this meeting is because the United States believes that the great-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For background, see BULLETIN of Aug. 15, 1960, p. 253.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For background, including the text of the U.S. proposals of June 27, see *ibid.*, July 18, 1960, p. 88.

<sup>\*</sup> Ibid.

est service that the Disarmament Commission could render would be to use its great influence to have disarmament negotiations resumed without delay. They are now stalled. What we ask of this Commission is to do all in its power to get the talks going again.

Now that, Mr. Chairman, is what I want to

say as to why we called this meeting.

The members of the Commission have before them the most important papers presented in the Ten-Nation Committee, including the United States proposal of June 27, which was presented on the same day that the Soviet Union walked out. It is contained in document DC/154, and I urge members of the Commission to study this paper. It proposes a number of concrete measures of disarmament. I mention this because Soviet documents circulated in the Commission assert time and again that the United States and its allies have proposed "no disarmament measures whatever." As you can see from these documents, that charge is entirely incorrect.

## Historical Background

ation

ed Na-

also to

ntative

to pre

s poin

eeting.

at time

nission.

meet-

ed, and

eal by

ting to

ut our

Chair-

t only

deneva

S VOLY

at the

think

o hear

which

d not

re it 18

ly we

eason

ing is

grest

S. pro-

ulletin

Mr. Chairman, the quest for disarmament is long and difficult. At difficult moments such as this we must keep a clear view of our fundamental goals. And they are these:

We want a world at peace: not the fearful peace of an armed truce but a genuine peace which rests

on trust among nations.

We want a world in which all nations and peoples, both great and small, are secure from aggression and can shape their destinies in freedom.

We want a world of open societies in which peoples are no longer separated by barriers of of-

ficial secrecy and official hatred.

We want a world whose rich resources and spectacular scientific prowess will be used not for conquest, nor for defense against the fear of conquest, but only for the welfare of mankind and the growth of the human spirit.

We want world peace under law which is in-

spired by justice.

And we want the kind of disarmament—which is both fair and fully verified—which will help the world toward those great ends.

The United States has pursued such a disarmament policy for many years. We have made farreaching, concrete proposals, of which I shall cite only a few.

1. In 1946, when the United States alone possessed atomic weapons, we proposed in the Baruch Plan complete international control of atomic energy, which would have meant giving up all national atomic armaments. This proposal was rejected by the Soviet Union. If they had accepted it, how different the world might be today!

2. In 1953 President Eisenhower, in his address to the General Assembly on atoms for peace, urged the Soviet Union to make with us joint contributions to an international pool of nuclear materials, thereby reducing our atomic weapons stockpiles. This proposal has never been agreed to by the Soviet Union.

3. In July 1955, at the Geneva summit meeting, President Eisenhower proposed that the Soviet Union join with the United States in mutual aerial inspection to guard against surprise attack.<sup>5</sup> This plan held great possibilities for peace, security, and disarmament. But it too was rejected by the Soviet Union.

4. In March 1956 President Eisenhower proposed that the Soviet Union join us in an inspected program to end all production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes and to reduce existing weapons stockpiles through gradual contributions to stockpiles under international control.<sup>6</sup> This too met with no response.

5. In August 1957 the United States and its allies proposed a system to prevent the use of outer space for military purposes. We have repeated this proposal several times and spelled it out in more detail in the meetings of the Ten-Nation Committee. The Soviet Union has not been willing to discuss this vital step.

6. In April 1958, in the Security Council, we responded to Soviet anxiety about bomber flights in the Arctic region by proposing a system of ground and air inspection against surprise attack.<sup>8</sup> Our resolution received 10 votes but was vetoed by the Soviet Union.

Only in one field related to disarmament, that is, the cessation of nuclear weapons tests, have we had any real promise of success. Progress there is slow, but the discussions are going on. This

<sup>&#</sup>x27;Ibid., Dec. 21, 1953, p. 847.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Ibid., Aug. 1, 1955, p. 173.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., Mar. 26, 1956, p. 514.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Ibid., Sept. 16, 1957, p. 451.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., May 19, 1958, p. 816.

negotiation suggests what might be accomplished if the same patient and constructive efforts could be applied to other definite, concrete parts of the disarmament problem.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the historical background for what I am now going to say.

## **Work of Ten-Nation Committee**

Against this background let me now take up the work of the Ten-Nation Committee. Whatever setbacks may have occurred, I think I have already said enough to show that the United States and its allies are hard to discourage and are determined to continue the search for a sound agreement. What I shall now say will therefore not be said in any spirit of recrimination but in a spirit of seeking the truth-which is the only basis for progress.

The United States brought to the 10-nation talks certain basic convictions born of experience. These can be stated as follows:

A sound disarmament plan must be broad enough in scope to take in all kinds of armaments and armed forces.

It must be concrete and realistic, tied to the growing complexity of modern weapons.

It must move step by step, always under adequate control, toward the ultimate goal of complete and general disarmament under effective international control.

It must be so fair at every stage that no country will gain a military advantage over another country at any stage.

It must include agreed procedures for settling international disputes peacefully, in accordance with the charter of the United Nations, after complete and general disarmament has been achieved.

Finally, before nations can proceed confidently with great reductions in weapons, a sound disarmament plan must reduce the enormous uncertainties and risks which exist today, which present a real danger of war by accident or miscalculation and which give a great impulse to the arms race.

We know what contributes to these risks and uncertainties. There is the danger of surprise attack prepared in secret; the threat of nuclear attack from outer space; the constantly mounting stockpiles of nuclear weapons; and the vast size of armed forces and nonnuclear weapons stocks. Those are the danger points which would be attacked in Stage One of the plan which we proposed

on June 27. This first stage is designed to build would safeguards against surprise attack, to stop further bring nuclear weapons production, to cut down existing sary f nuclear weapons stocks, to start cutting nonnucleur armaments and armed forces, and to take the firs arrang steps to prevent the militarizing of outer space to wor

When those steps are completed at the end of such s Stage One, we believe we will have a much more to ver stable situation in which nations can move conficatego dently toward general and complete disarma is what ment-the complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the reduction of national envisa armed forces to levels required only for internal duction security and to meet obligations under the United Nations Charter.

or con

weapo

ment h

Tha

would

to leve

taining

securit

tingent

would

expend

would

upon v

to the 1

We

the firs

the sec

prepar

confere

accede

Now

full of

destruc

armed

in the

to you

mission

provisi

whatev

tution

measur

nage or

recent

contrar

Septem

The disarmament plan put forward in General duction by the Western Powers on March 149 and that on an i proposed by the United States on June 27 were establi both designed to accomplish these aims. You have world already received copies of the June 27 proposal We believe—and the other Western Powers also believe—that it forms an entirely reasonable and practical basis for negotiations and for the conclusions of agreements which would lead to our ultimate goal.

## Western Three-Stage Plan

This proposal is of course not control without disarmament, as has been alleged by the Soviet Union. It contains far-reaching, concrete disarmament measures. It is realistic. It envisages disarmament as proceeding through three stages, each containing measures which are phased, safe guarded, and fair to all. Each of these stages would be carried out within an agreed and definite time period under the supervision of an international disarmament control organization within the framework of the United Nations. It also reflects our conviction that in the process of disarmament no state should obtain military advantage by reason of this process over another.

The first stage, to be embodied in a treaty by the 10 nations involved in the conference, includes initial and controllable measures which can and should be undertaken without delay for these reasons: to preclude expansion of armed forces and of weapons stockpiles; to reduce armed forces and armaments; to ban the launching of weapons of mass destruction into outer space; and to provide against surprise attack. These measures

<sup>°</sup> For text, see ibid., Apr. 4, 1960, p. 511.

to build would do much to reduce the risk of wars and to further bring about the increase in confidence so necessary for achievement of disarmament. We sugexisting nnuclear gested that while we were negotiating this treaty the first arrangements should be made for technical studies r space to work out necessary control arrangements. One such study would concern the measures necessary ch more to verify control over and elimination of agreed ve conficategories of nuclear delivery systems. Now that what I want to say about the first stage.

end of

lisarma-

pons of

internal

Geneva

roposal

to our

without

Sovie

lisarm

ges dis-

es, each

, safe-

stages

definite

interwithin

It also

of dis-

advan

aty by

cludes

an and

these

forces

forces

eapons

o pro-

easures

r.

The second stage of the United States proposal national envisaged further reduction of armed forces, reduction in armaments of all kinds, and destruction United or conversion to peaceful use of the discarded weapons. Agreement would be reached on a reduction in expenditures for military purposes and nd that on an international peace force, to be progressively 27 were established within the United Nations to preserve ou have world peace when general and complete disarmament has been achieved.

That gets us to the final stage, and the final stage ers also ble and would see the reduction of military establishments he conto levels required only for the purposes of maintaining internal order, of insuring personal security of citizens, and of providing agreed contingents to the international peace force. There would be a commensurate reduction of military expenditures, and no manufacture of armaments would be permitted except for supplying agreedupon weapons to the international peace force and to the remaining national contingents.

> We proposed that after reaching agreement on the first stage of the program an agreed treaty on the second and third stages of the program be prepared for submission to a world disarmament conference. There we hope that all states would accede to the treaties.

> Now, Mr. Chairman, that plan of June 27 is so full of concrete measures for the elimination and destruction of weapons and the demobilization of armed forces that it is really astonishing to read in the Soviet Union's letter of July 31, addressed to you as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, that our proposal of June 27 "makes no provision for any real disarmament measures whatever but reduces the whole issue to the institution of control without disarmament—i.e., of measures to legalize an extensive system of espiopage on an international scale." That, and other recent Soviet statements like it, are so obviously contrary to ascertainable facts which I have just

cited—and which you can easily confirm yourselves—that I cannot really think that the Soviet officials who wrote that letter really believe their own statements.

And as for calling inspection espionage, this seems once again to show the Soviet obsession with secrecy which so hampers all realistic efforts toward disarmament. The facts are clear. The United States does not propose, and has never proposed, a single measure of inspection on Soviet territory which we are not prepared to accept also on United States territory. When the Soviet representatives talk that way the world must ask: "What have you got to hide?"

The three-stage plan which we proposed on June 27 is not a short process. It cannot be exactly defined as regards time. But its goal is clear, its methods are clear, and its urgent initial steps can be agreed upon promptly. When those steps are taken they will themselves generate the confidence born of experience and success, which is now so sorely lacking and which is so necessary for further progress. Ours is no mere collection of cloudy principles. It is concrete and definite, and it can be done.

## **Concessions to Soviet Views**

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, our proposal of June 27 made genuine concessions to Soviet views. I must emphasize this because the Soviet representatives have done rather their best to create the opposite impression. For instance, Mr. Gromyko [Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs] in his letter to the Secretary-General, dated the very same day, June 27—which he sent without even waiting to hear the proposal which he knew we were about to make—said: "The United States and the other Western Powers . . . failed to take a single step to meet the Soviet Union's position"—et cetera, et cetera. And that was made before he had been willing to hear our statement.

Here is a list of the concessions to the Soviet view which we embodied in our proposal of June 27:

- 1. We included a definition of general and complete disarmament, in terms not very different from the Soviet definition.
- 2. We accepted the principle that each measure of a disarmament program would be carried out in an agreed and strictly defined period of time.

3. We adopted a provision based on the Soviet plan of June 2 for a review by the Security Council of the progress of disarmament at the end of each disarmament stage. This is something they wanted.

4. We agreed to a figure of 1.7 million for the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. and the United States in the second stage of the disarmament program.

That is a real thing to agree to.

5. We accepted a technical examination of measures necessary to control, reduce, and eliminate agreed categories of nuclear delivery systems, including missiles, aircraft, surface ships, submarines, and artillery. This concerned a measure to which the Soviet Union had given first place in its disarmament program. And this, Mr. Chairman, we accepted.

I think that is evidence of our real will to reach an agreement. In fact, after the Ten-Nation Committee reconvened on June 7, following the collapse of the summit meeting, we immediately made clear our interest in the new Soviet paper of June 2. The United States representative, Mr. Eaton, sought clarification from Mr. [Valerian] Zorin on several points, then returned to Washington for consultations. Our delegation made it clear to the Soviet representative that these consultations were intended to facilitate progress in the negotiations. The very morning that Mr. Eaton returned to Geneva, that is, June 27, he informed Mr. Zorin that a new United States proposal would be made within a few days, after consultation with our allies.

But the Soviet delegation and its associates evidently had other purposes. That same day, June 27, 20 days after making their last proposal and almost on the eve of receiving our reply, they made a series of speeches bitterly attacking the motives of the Allied nations. When the Allied delegates sought the floor, the Polish representative, who happened to be in the chair that day, arbitrarily refused them the right to speak—which is certainly a flagrant breach of parliamentary procedure and of common courtesy. In spite of an attempt by the Soviet side to end the conference then and there, it continued under the chairmanship of the United Kingdom representative and the United States proposal was submitted. By that time, of course, they had gone.

In the light of that performance, Mr. Chairman, it is hard to understand Mr. Khrushchev's state-

ment, both in his letter of June 27 to President Eisenhower 10 and in his interview with Pravda which has been circulated to the Commission, that the United States and the other Allied nations do not wish to conduct serious negotiations on disarmament. That was the reason he gave for withdrawing from the Geneva talks. But nothing, we say, could be further from the truth.

unless

soon c

Onc

road.

at bes

and p

sions

implie

It beg

fear

leads

finally

human

we ha

that r

factor

lished

that C

Two N

Mr.

with v

of neg

to the

so nov

tion of

In the

when

ties of

intern

lated

reduci

now in

propos

Union

also or

grams

which

would

Let.

kilogra

our me

explos

that of

all the

That is

I wi]

The

The

In

On

It was, in fact, the Soviet Union which presented an "all or nothing" proposition to the Ten-Nation Committee. The Soviet spokesmen said in effect that we must accept their plan for general and complete disarmament, with all its vague language, or there would be no disarmament. They insisted that a treaty covering the whole process of complete disarmament should be signed before inspection arrangements could be worked out—in a word that we should buy a pig in a poke. Then they walked out when we had had less than a month to consider and react to their proposal.

Now, that is what happened. That is not a policy of negotiation. It is more like a policy of threats and ultimatums.

## **Dangers of Delay**

Mr. Chairman, the United States refuses to be discouraged. But we should lose no time in resuming disarmament discussions on some basis which promises progress. Modern armaments are constantly growing more complex and more difficult to control or to abolish with certainty. We must not wait, as the Soviet Union seems to want us to do, while the problems grow more difficult and more dangerous.

Let me give one example of the dangers of delay. The Allied nations have proposed an early agreement to ban the stationing of weapons of mass destruction in outer space. If we do not grasp this opportunity now, the day is sure to come before very long when the disarmament negotiations will have passed another point of no return—just as we did a decade ago in the case of detection of concealed nuclear weapons. If that happens in the case of outer-space weapons we will be threatened by weapons and vehicles which can fly deep into space and by bombardment satellites hovering above us against the background of stars and planets. Now that is not science fiction. It is a technical certainty

Department of State Bulletin Septem

<sup>10</sup> For text, see ibid., July 18, 1960, p. 92.

mless the nations which can launch such vehicles soon cooperate to prevent it.

Once again we seem to stand at a fork in the road. On one side is the road either to war or, at best, to a growing burden of ever more complex and powerful weapons, with all the fear and tensions and real dangers that such a situation implies.

On the other side is the road to disarmament. It begins with first steps which can reduce the fear of accidental war or surprise attack. It leads to the steady growth of confidence and finally to an age when man can at last turn to humane works worthy of his genius.

In the Ten-Nation Committee it seemed that we had made a good beginning toward finding that road. It is a forum which was quite satisfactory to the Soviet Union when it was established last year. We believe that negotiations in that Committee should be resumed at once.

## Two New Proposals

resident

Pravda

ion, that

tions do

on dis-

or with

ning, we

resented

-Nation

in effect

nd com-

uage, or

insisted

of com

inspec

a word

en they

onth t

s not

olicy of

s to be

in re-

e basis

nts are

e diffi

y. We

o want

lifficult

delay.

early

ons of

lo not

ure to

ent ne

of no

e case

s. If

apons

hicles

ibard-)

st the

hat is

tainty

Mr. Chairman, as proof of the serious purpose with which the United States requests the renewal of negotiations, I am authorized to present today to the Soviet Union two new proposals, and I do so now.

The first proposal relates to ending the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. In the past the United States has proposed that, when this production was cut off, agreed quantities of fissionable materials be transferred, under international supervision, from existing accumulated weapons stocks to peaceful uses, thereby reducing directly the number of nuclear weapons now in national arsenals.

The United States is ready to carry out this proposal on a reciprocal basis with the Soviet Union. In doing so the United States is ready, also on a reciprocal basis, to set aside 30,000 kilograms of weapons-grade U-235 as the amount which the United States and the Soviet Union would each initially transfer.

Let me say by way of explanation that 30,000 kilograms of weapons-grade U-235, if used in our modern nuclear weapons, would generate an explosive force well over 1,000 times greater than that of all the high-explosive bombs dropped by all the warring powers during World War II. That is what that means.

I will repeat that because I think it is impressive.

Thirty thousand kilograms of weapons-grade U-235, if used in our modern nuclear weapons, would generate an explosive force well over 1,000 times greater than that of all the high-explosive bombs dropped by all the warring powers during World War II.

The transfer of that amount to peaceful uses by the United States, and an equal amount by the Soviet Union, would mean an immediate and sizable reduction in the nuclear threat. It would be a real and practical measure of disarmament. And I put that today before the Soviet Union.

If the Soviet Union is not prepared to join in a plan of this kind, I am authorized to propose another proposal, a second direction in which we might now make a start. The United States is ready to join the Soviet Union in halting by successive steps the production of fissionable materials for weapons use. We are prepared to shut down, one by one, under international inspection, our major plants producing enriched uranium and plutonium, if the Soviet Union will shut down equivalent facilities. We are prepared to do this now—with no delay at all.

The United States is eager to renew negotiations on concrete disarmament measures such as these. We are willing to hear new Soviet proposals.

If we do not act now and act effectively, history may leave us behind—all of us here in this room and the countries we represent. The peoples of the world demand that this tragedy should not be allowed to happen.

Whatever issues of philosophy or recent history may lie between us, the United States and the Soviet Union share the heaviest responsibility for solving the problem of armaments. We must work together to solve it. We again invite the Soviet Union to work with us—not with the object of one of us putting the other in the wrong and thus winning a small victory of some sort. Victories of that kind are likely to prove hollow very soon. Let us rather join to win a common victory for the future of mankind.

## STATEMENT OF AUGUST 17

U.S./U.N. press release 3458

My statement is a statement of clarification. It is not with regard to the statement that I made; it

is with regard to the statement that one of the members of the Commission has made.

One of the members said yesterday, in speaking of the new proposals which I put forward, that: "The proposals . . . imply primarily an invitation for future manufacture of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. What is more important, they do not imply the destruction of stockpiles at present existing."

This represents such a fundamental misunderstanding of the new United States proposal that it is important for me to make an early clarification.

Two brief points I think will suffice:

1. Since all future manufacture of fissionable materials would go to peaceful uses only—and not into weapons—it is obviously incorrect to characterize our proposal as an invitation to make more weapons. I repeat, under our proposal all plants producing enriched uranium and plutonium would either be completely shut down or their output earmarked exclusively for peaceful purposes. That evidently was not understood.

2. Our proposal was for the transfer of weapons-grade U-235—30,000 kilograms of it. For our part, the only place from which this material could come is from present weapons stockpiles. Therefore this transfer would directly and immediately result in the dismantling of sizable numbers of presently existing weapons.

## STATEMENT OF AUGUST 18

U.S./U.N. press release 3459

The United States asked for these meetings of the Disarmament Commission, and we wish to thank all members for attending and taking such assiduous part in the proceedings.

We hoped that the United Nations Disarmament Commission would take the view that this disarmament matter is an urgent matter and that negotiations should be resumed at the earliest possible moment.

We felt sure that any United Nations body must always be in favor of the resumption of negotiations on disarmament. Not only have we not been disappointed; we have accomplished everything and a little more than we desired.

We are very grateful indeed to all of you, and we thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having presided in your usual excellent manner.

## TEXT OF RESOLUTION 11

The Disarmament Commission,

Recalling its resolution of 10 September 1959, welcoming the resumption of disarmament negotiations and expressing the hope that such negotiations would provide useful basis for the consideration of disarmament in the United Nations,

Noting with regret that these negotiations have not yielded the expected positive results,

Reaffirming the continuing and ultimate responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament,

Taking into account resolution 1378 (XIV) adopted unanimously by the General Assembly on 20 November 1959

Recommends to the fifteenth session of the General Assembly to give earnest consideration to the question of disarmament:

Considers it necessary and recommends that in view of the urgency of the problem continued efforts be made for the earliest possible continuation of international negotiations to achieve a constructive solution of the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control;

Recommends to the General Assembly that the Disarmament Commission as set up in General Assembly resolution 1252 (XIII) should continue in being and be convened whenever deemed necessary.

## TEXT OF FIVE-POWER REPORT

The U.S. Mission to the United Nations and nounced on August 12 (U.S./U.N. press release 3455) that the representatives of Canada, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States had transmitted on that date to Ambassador Luis Padilla Nervo, Chairman of the U.N. Disarmament Commission, the following report to the Commission prepared by their Governments.

1. In establishing the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament in 1959, the responsibility of the UN in the field of disarmament was recognized. The nations concerned pledged to keep the UN Disarmament Commission informed of the progress of its deliberations. The Gorennents of Canada, France, Italy, the U.K. and the U.S. therefore, wish to inform the members of the Disarmament Commission of the events connected with the disruption of the work of the conference of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament, a conference to which they attached great importance.

m part of t mitted by the confe and insis concepts of tions Ger general a ty plans; w that goal et the first

have ser

2. The

ened on

the perio

the disba prohibiti whatsoev 3. On laid befor plan. Ju delegation Soviet U 27, without verbatim quests of disregare

and, with

conferen 4. Des

tion and

tensely a tion, insibe avails: Powers Governm off the obeen no resume is are dete successfibelief th to an envailed in

believe i
which m
could, in
5. In a
ion and
General
which ca
achieve
wishes o

lution of cerned t solution ment un

"U.N.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> U.N. doc. DC/182/Corr. 1; adopted unanimously by the Disarmament Commission on Aug. 18.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> For text of the official report made to the Secretary of State by the U.S. delegation to the Conference of the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament, see BULLETIN of Aug-22, 1960, p. 267.

2 The conference of the Ten-Nation Committee conrened on March 15, 1960 in Geneva and recessed during the period of April 29 through June 7. During the first part of the proceedings (March 15-April 29), a plan submitted by the allied delegations on March 16 was before and er provide a the conference. The Soviet delegation rejected this plan nt in the and insisted that the discussions be based on the general concepts advanced by the Soviet Union at the United Nahave not tions General Assembly in September 1959.13 The goal of general and complete disarmament was common to both nsibility plans; what was at issue was the question of how to reach that goal. The readily attainable measures set forth in the first two stages of the Western plan of March 16 would adopted have served as practical and constructive steps toward the disbandment of the armed forces of all states and the prohibition of their re-establishment in any whatsoever.

welcom.

nt.

ovember

General

question

view of

nade for

negotia

estion of

ve inter-

he Dis

and be

ns an

release

United

ssador

7. Dis-

ort to

rents.12

on Dis

in the

ns con-

mission

ne Gov

ie U.S

sarma

he dis

Nation

h they

sly by

tary of

e Ten-

f Aug.

3. On June 7, the Soviet delegation and its associates laid before the conference a revision of its disarmament Just three weeks later, on June 28, the Western delegations were obliged to adjourn the conference. The delegations of the Eastern European countries, led by the Soviet Union, walked out of the conference room on June I, without warning. It will be seen from the available verbatim record of this meeting that the Chairman at ssembly that time, the Polish delegate, denied the repeated requests of the Western delegates for the right to speak in disregard of all accepted rules of procedure and practice and, without authority to do so, attempted to declare the conference ended.

4. Despite this action on the part of the Soviet delegation and its associates, the Western Powers, being intensely aware of the seriousness of the disarmament question, instructed their delegations to remain in Geneva to be available to resume negotiations. The five Western rance. Powers each despatched communications to the Soviet Government, asking that it reconsider its decision to break off the disarmament negotiations. Thus far, there has been no indication that the Soviet Union is prepared to resume negotiations. Nevertheless, the Western nations are determined to persevere in their efforts toward the successful outcome of disarmament negotiations, in the belief that such negotiations must not be allowed to come o an end. Although a serious difference of view prevailed in the Ten-Nation Committee, the Western nations believe it is imperative to carry out further discussion which may permit a reconciliation of differences, which could, in turn, lead to important agreements.

5. In abruptly breaking off negotiations, the Soviet Unon and its associates have gone against the wishes of the General Assembly, as expressed in Resolution 1378 (XIV) which called upon "Governments to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem," and the wishes of the Security Council, as expressed in the Resolution of May 27, which requested the "Governments concerned to continue their efforts to achieve a constructive solution of the question of general and complete disarmament under effective international control in accordance

with Resolution 1378 (XIV) of the General Assembly." It is difficult to explain the reasons for this decision in view of repeated avowals on the part of the USSR of the importance of disarmament negotiations.

6. The proposals advanced by the Western Powers in the negotiations contained a comprehensive program consisting of concrete measures which if negotiated and put into effect would lead to general, complete and verified disarmament. Just prior to the Soviet bloc's walkout, the U.S. Representative informed the Soviet Delegate that further constructive proposals were soon to be made. These facts refute the Soviet contention that the Western Powers were not willing to negotiate. If the USSR had remained at the table, the Ten-Nation conference could have produced important agreement in the areas of conventional and nuclear arms reduction, surprise attack and This would have resulted in outer space controls. strengthening world security without creating military advantages to any party, and would have begun the advance toward the goal of general, complete and verified

7. The desire of the Western Powers to make progress was, however, frustrated by the rigid attitude of the Soviet Union. The behavior of the Soviet delegate and his associates implied that the entire Soviet program of disarmament had to be accepted or there would be no disarmament at all. Such a position is contrary to the spirit and purpose of any meaningful negotiations and indeed does not accord with the Soviet Government's own statement, in its most recent proposals on disarmament, that "it was prepared to take into account any constructive considerations and desires of other participants in the negotiations, that will contribute to the achievement of an agreement on the practical implementation of disarmament." Throughout the short period of just three weeks between the submission of the new Soviet proposals and the withdrawal of the East European delegations those delegations displayed reluctance and impatience over reasonable requests for elaboration of their proposals. It could hardly be expected that the problem of disarmament could be solved in so short a time.

8. In their abrupt break-off of the negotiations, the Soviet delegation and its associates did not cooperate in fulfilling the obligation to bring the records of the proceedings of the conference to the UN Disarmament Commission. Consequently, at the final meeting on June 28, which was not attended by the Soviets and East European delegations, the Western delegations gave authorization for this to be done. The present report is an introductory explanation of these records.

9. In conclusion, the Governments of Canada, France, Italy, the U.K. and the U.S. reaffirm that they are prepared to direct their delegations to return to Geneva at any time the Soviet Union is prepared to resume these important discussions in the Ten-Nation Committee. The Western nations hope that the Disarmament Commission will be instrumental in reactivating disarmament negotiations without delay, and pledge to the Commission their earnest cooperation in its deliberations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> U.N. doc. A/4219.

## Security Council Considers New Difficulties in Congo

## STATEMENT BY HENRY CABOT LODGE 1

The decisions which we must take today follow from those which we took on two previous occasions.<sup>2</sup> At that time the United Nations decided to assist in the establishment of order in the Congo, on the one hand, and, on the other, to achieve the withdrawal of Belgian troops from the whole country. The United Nations was on the right track ther; it is on the right track now.

Since our fateful decisions of July 14 and July

22, what has happened?

First, the United Nations, with the Secretary-General leading the way, has so far transported 11,500 troops to the Congo and has deployed them to points in five of the six provinces. We commend the Secretary-General for his efficiency, his drive, and his courage.

Second, all Belgian troops from five of the six provinces have now been moved to their home base of Kitona on the western edge of the Congo. Fifteen hundred have actually left for Belgium, and we have Belgian assurances that this number

is steadily growing.

Third, the gratifying speed and effectiveness of the United Nations action has come up against a thorny but, we believe, temporary obstacle in Katanga. The Secretary-General has now quite properly come back to the Security Council for support and instructions in completing his task.

This brings us squarely to the problem of Katanga. The Secretary-General in his latest report to the Council <sup>3</sup> has wisely separated the internal political aspect of this problem, which lies *outside* the concern of the United Nations, from the task of the United Nations, which is to insure peace and security and thereby the withdrawal of Belgian troops.

The task of the Council today is to help the Secretary-General get on with his job in Katanga. To do this we must reinforce the Secretary-General's view that the United Nations cannot be drawn into the political struggle between Prime Minister [Patrice] Lumumba and Provincial President [Moise] Tshombe.

tanga.
tion to
for Be
under
retary-

order. The ties in

United

sured :

tions

Belgia

reason

from I

way to

stake.

mornin

Congo

hearte

put off

waters

the Ur

unto it

ent act

essary

should

and it

United

TEXT '

The S

alia, ca

ment sp

(8/4387

ing the

this effe

Havis

on the

and his

Havin

sentativ

this Cou

United

lutions

Congo o

Notin

4 U.N.

with 2 a

For

For

Septem

Notin

Mr.

The United Nations Charter and United Nations practice for 15 years emphasize that the United Nations cannot be involved in internal

political disputes.

Let me now speak of the presence of Belgian troops in Katanga. We understand the motive which led Belgium some time ago to reinforce her troops in the Congo, which includes Katanga. But the presence of those troops became a source of friction between Belgium and the Congo. The Belgian Government, therefore, pulled back its troops as United Nations forces came into position

This process should now be extended to Ka-

## President Welcomes Security Council Resolution on the Congo

Statement by President Eisenhower

White House press release dated August 10

I believe that the Security Council resolution adopted early yesterday represents another step forward in the United Nations determination, under the Secretary-General's tireless efforts, to find a peaceful solution to the difficult situation in the Congo.

The United States welcomes the steps Belgium has already taken and has said it will take in conformity with the Security Council resolutions. Belgium has contributed much in past years to the development of the Congo. The United States hopes that loyal cooperation with the United Nations on the part of all concerned will restore confidence between the Belgian and Congolese peoples and enable Belgian civilians to continue their contributions in the development of the new Congolese state.

384

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Made in the U.N. Security Council on Aug. 8 (U.S./ U.N. press release 3454). Ambassador Lodge is U.S. Representative in the Security Council.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> For background, see Bulletin of Aug. 1, 1960, p. 159, and Aug. 8, 1960, p. 221.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> U.N. doc. S/4417 and Corr. 1, Add. 1/Rev. 1, and Add. 2.

langa. United Nations forces are now in a position to move into Katanga. The time has come for Belgian withdrawal at the earliest moment inder arrangements to be worked out by the Secretary-General for the preservation of law and order.

The United States considers that local authorities in Katanga will have no grounds to object to United Nations forces once the Council has assured them that the only task of the United Nations is to insure law and order and thereby Belgian withdrawal. Nor can Belgium have any reason any longer to postpone speedy withdrawal from Katanga.

Mr. President, the United Nations is well on its way to a great achievement in the Congo. At stake, as the Secretary-General so well said this nternal morning, is the issue of peace not only for the Congo but for the world. We must not be disheartened by some rough weather, nor must we be put off by those who are trying to fish in troubled waters. At the 877th session I stated, on behalf of the United States, that no nation could arrogate unto itself the right to make threats of independent action concerning the Congo. It becomes necessary to repeat that word of caution today. All should help the efforts of the United Nations; and it is imperative that none work against the United Nations effort.

## TEXT OF RESOLUTION 4

The Security Council,

atanga

ry-Gen-

nnot be

Prime

vincial

ed Na-

nat the

Belgian

notives

rce her

a. But

arce of

. The

ack its

sition

tion

step

tion,

, to

n in

ium

con-

Bel-

the

ates

Na-

on-

oles

eon-

ese

Recalling its resolution of 22 July 1960 (S/4405).5 inter alia, calling upon the Government of Belgium to implement speedily the Security Council resolution of 14 July (8/4387) on the withdrawal of their troops and authorizing the Secretary-General to take all necessary action to this effect,

Having noted the second report by the Secretary-General on the implementation of the aforesaid two resolutions and his statement before the Council,

Having considered the statements made by the representatives of Belgium and the Republic of the Congo to this Council at this meeting.

Noting with satisfaction the progress made by the United Nations in carrying out the Security Council resolutions in respect of the territory of the Republic of the Congo other than the Province of Katanga,

Noting however that the United Nations had been pre-

'U.N. doc. S/4426; adopted on Aug. 9 by a vote of 9 to 0,

Press release 439 dated August 9

The airlift of United Nations troops and equipment into the Congo is now about completed. The following summarizes the part that the United States played in this phase of the operation.

As of August 7, U.S. Air Force planes had lifted to the Congo 9,190 troops from eight countries and 1,134.6 tons of equipment. These were:

2,400 Moroccan troops and 277 tons of equipment;

2,259 Tunisian troops and 232.8 tons of equipment;

637 Ghanaian troops and 55 tons of equipment;

625 Guinea troops and 57 tons of equipment and rations:

612 Swedish troops and 182.5 tons of equipment; 250 Liberian troops and 10 tons of equipment;

1,168 Ethiopian troops and 101.3 tons of equipment;

673 Irish troops and 125.5 tons of equipment; and 566 Mali troops and 93.5 tons of equipment.

In addition, the following items were furnished and transported by the United States: 400 tons of flour: 6 H-13 and 2 H-19 U.S. helicopters; 6 light U.S. reconnaissance aircraft: 10 C-47 and 5 C-119 U.S. transport aircraft; 20 U.S. jeeps; and 11,000 helmet liners. Additionally transportation was provided for 6 Swedish light aircraft and 2 Norwegian light aircraft.

All of this was done within a period of 16 days.

This is not only an impressive demonstration of the capability and effectiveness of our Defense Establishment but also a demonstration of this Government's firm commitment to the principles of the United Nations and its willingness and ability to implement that commitment in support of peace and security.

vented from implementing the aforesaid resolutions in the Province of Katanga although it was ready, and in fact attempted, to do so,

Recognizing that the withdrawal of Belgian troops from the Province of Katanga will be a positive contribution to and essential for the proper implementation of the Security Council resolutions,

1. Confirms the authority given to the Secretary-General by the Security Council resolutions of 14 July and 22 July 1960 and requests him to continue to carry out the responsibility placed on him thereby;

2. Calls upon the Government of Belgium to withdraw immediately its troops from the Province of Katanga under speedy modalities determined by the Secretary-General and to assist in every possible way the implementation of the Council's resolutions;

3. Declares that the entry of the United Nations force into the Province of Katanga is necessary for the full implementation of this resolution;

with 2 abstentions (Poland and U.S.S.R.). For text, see Bulletin of Aug. 8, 1960, p. 223.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>For text, see ibid., Aug. 1, 1960, p. 161.

Summary of U.S. Support for Airlift of U.N. Troops and Equipment Into Congo

4. Reaffirms that the United Nations force in the Congo will not be a party to or in any way intervene in or be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise;

5. Calls upon all Member States, in accordance with Articles 25 and 49 of the Charter, to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council and to afford mutual assistance in carrying out measures decided upon by the Security Council;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to implement this resolution and to report further to the Security Council as appropriate.

## **International Bank Issues Year-End Financial Statement**

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on August 9 reported additions of \$86.5 million to its reserves during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, raising its total reserves to \$506.4 million.

Additions during the year were made up of net earnings of \$59.5 million, which were placed in the supplemental reserve against losses on loans and guarantees, and loan commissions of \$27 million, which were credited to the special reserve. These figures compare to net earnings of \$46.5 million and loan commissions of \$24 million in the fiscal year 1959. On June 30 the supplemental reserve totaled \$341.6 million and the special reserve was \$164.8 million.

Gross income, exclusive of loan commissions, was \$150.9 million, compared with \$122 million in the preceding year. Expenses, which included \$77 million for interest on Bank borrowing and other financial expenses, totaled \$91.4 million, compared with \$76 million last year.

During the year the Bank made 31 loans totaling the equivalent of \$658.7 million, compared with a total of \$703 million last year. brought the gross total of loan commitments at June 30 to \$5,181 million. This year's loans were made in Algeria and Sahara, Austria, Belgian Congo, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Honduras, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Rhodesia and Nyasaland, the Sudan, United Arab Republic, and Uruguay.

Disbursements were \$544 million, compared with \$583 million in the preceding year. Cumulative disbursements amounted to \$3,921 million on June 30, 1960.

During the year the Bank sold or agreed to sel annual I \$242.6 million principal amount of loans, all with for Re out its guarantee. On June 30 the total sales of United loans amounted to \$811 million, of which \$69 mil lion was with the Bank's guarantee,

Principal repayments received by the Bank during the year amounted to \$73.7 million, and borrowers repaid \$84.4 million on parts of their loans which were held by other investors. This brought total repayments to \$659 million on June 30, consisting of \$338 million repaid to the Bank and \$321 million repaid to the purchasers of borrowers' obligations sold by the Bank.

## **Current U.N. Documents:** A Selected Bibliography<sup>1</sup>

## **General Assembly**

Final Report of the Secretary-General Evaluating the Second United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Relation to the Holding of Similar Conferences in the Future. A/4391. July 5, 1960. 6 pp.

Question of the Publication of a United Nations Juridical Yearbook. Report of the Secretary-General. A/4406. July 19, 1960. 25 pp.

United Nations Emergency Force: Budget Estimates for the Period 1 January to 31 December 1961. Second Disarm report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to the General Assembly at Letter 1 its 15th session. A/4409. July 21, 1960. 3 pp.

Letter Dated 19 July 1960 From the Permanent Repre sentative of Italy to the United Nations, Addressed to Letter 1 the Secretary-General Concerning the Breakup of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Conference. A/4421. July 22. 1960. 4 pp.

Letter Dated 15 July 1960 From the Permanent Repre sentative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the United Nations, Addressed to the Secretary-Gen eral Concerning Disarmament. A/4423. July 25, 1960 35 pp.

## **Economic and Social Council**

Council Committee on Non-governmental Organizations United Nations Report on the Promotion of the Inter national Flow of Private Capital. Statement sul mitted by the International Chamber of Commerce

E/C.2/556. June 8, 1960. 9 pp. World Economic Situation: Ways and Means of Promo ing Wider Trade Co-operation Among States. liminary report by the Secretary-General. E/338 June 13, 1960. 32 pp.
Consolidated Work Programme in the Economic, Social

and Human Rights Fields. Statement submitted by the Secretary-General. E/3399. June 15, 1960.

ceived

18 pp.

24,

Septer

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Printed materials may be secured in the United State from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, NJ Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

ed to sell annual Report of the United Nations High Commissioner

all with for Refugees. E/3397. June 15, 1960. 85 pp. sales of United Nations Capital Development Fund. Replies received from governments. E/3393/Add. 1. June 16, 1960. 5 pp.

Provisional Agenda for the Thirtieth Session of the Economic and Social Council. Application from Kuwait for membership in UNESCO. E/3363/Add. 2. June ne Bank 17, 1960. 5 pp.

ion, and Calendar of Conferences for 1961. Memorandum by the of their Secretary-General. E.3400. June 17, 1960. 7 pp. Government of Chile on the Situation in the South of on June the Country and on the Reconstruction Programme in Course of Preparation. E/CN.12/AC.46/2. June 25, he Bank

1960. 69 pp. s of bor-Meeting of the Group of Experts on Geographical Names, 20 June-1 July 1960. Draft Recommendations: Draft Chapter III, Recommendations on Problems of Domestic Standardization of Geographic Names. E/CONF.-33/L.2. June 29, 1960. 9 pp.

Economic Commission for Latin America. Report on the Third Extraordinary Session of the Committee of the Whole of the Economic Commission for Latin America, 28-30 June 1960. E/3402. June 30, 1960.

United Nations Tin Conference, 1960. Second International Tin Agreement. Adopted at the final plenary session held at U.N. headquarters on June 24, 1960. E/CONF.32/4. July 1, 1960. 58 pp.

## n to the A/4391 Trusteeship Council

\$69 mil-

ating the

ce on the

Juridical

A/4406.

nates for

istrative

t Repre

ublics t ary-Gen-25, 1960

izations

ne Inter

ent sub mmerce

Promot A pre

E/3389

. 32 pp

d States

olumbia

27, N.I

uments

s in the

Ninth Report of the Committee on Rural Economic Development of the Trust Territories. T/1544. June 24, 1960. 146 pp.

## Second Disarmament Commission

embly a Letter Dated 19 July 1960 From the Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations, Addressed to t Repre the Secretary-General. DC/153. July 22, 1960. 4 pp. ressed b Letter Dated 22 July 1960 From the Permanent Reprep of the sentative of the United States to the United Nations, 1. July Addressed to the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. DC/154. July 22, 1960. 8 pp.

## TREATY INFORMATION

## **Current Actions**

## MULTILATERAL

### , Social **Automotive Traffic** itted by

Convention on road traffic and annexes. Done at Geneva September 19, 1949. Entered into force March 26, 1952. TIAS 2487.

Applications to: St. Vincent and Sierra Leone (with reservations and declarations) and North Borneo (with reservation), April 22, 1960; Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (with declaration), April 24, 1960.

### Aviation

Protocol amending articles 48(a), 49(e), and 61 of convention on international civil aviation (TIAS 1591) by providing that sessions of the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization shall be held not less than once in 3 years instead of annually. Done at Montreal June 14, 1954. Entered into force December 12, 1956. TIAS 3756. Ratification deposited: Costa Rica, July 5, 1960.

## **Cultural Relations**

Agreement on the importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials, and protocol. Done at Lake Success November 22, 1950. Entered into force May 21, Ratification deposited: Guatemala, July 8, 1960.

## **Cultural Property**

Convention for protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict, and regulations of execution; Protocol for protection of cultural property in event of armed conflict. Done at The Hague May 14, 1954. Entered into force August 7, 1956.1 Ratifications deposited: Nicaragua, November 25, 1959; Lebanon, June 1, 1960. Accession deposited: Liechtenstein, April 28, 1960.

### Finance

Agreement on German external debts. Signed at London February 27, 1953. Entered into force September 16, 1953. TIAS 2792. Extension to: Syrian Province of the United Arab Republic, July 8, 1960.

## **Property**

Convention of Paris for the protection of industrial property of March 20, 1883, revised at Brussels December 14, 1900, at Washington June 2, 1911, at The Hague November 6, 1925, at London June 2, 1934, and at Lisbon October 31, 1958. Done at Lisbon October 31, 1958. Ratification advised by the Senate: August 17, 1960.

International wheat agreement, 1959, with annex. Opened for signature at Washington April 6 through 24, 1959. Entered into force July 16, 1959, for part I and parts III to VIII, and August 1, 1959, for part II. TIAS

Acceptance deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, August 15, 1960.

## BILATERAL

## Argentina

Agreement relating to the appointment of officers to constitute a U.S. Army mission to Argentina. Signed at Buenos Aires August 2, 1960. Entered into force August 2, 1960.

## Brazil

Agreement amending agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy of August 3, 1955, as amended (TIAS 3303 and 4255). Signed at Washington June 11, 1960. Entered into force: August 2, 1960.

<sup>1</sup> Not in force for the United States.

<sup>2</sup> Not in force.

### Chile

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreement of June 2, 1960 (TIAS 4501). Effected by exchange of notes at Santiago August 12, 1960. Entered into force August 12, 1960.

### France

Convention of establishment, protocol, and declaration. Signed at Paris November 25, 1959.3 Ratification advised by the Senate: August 17, 1960.

Agreement amending the agreement of February 2, 1950, as amended (TIAS 2054, 2881, and 4318), for financing certain educational exchange programs. by exchange of notes at New Delhi May 9 and July 29, 1960. Entered into force July 29, 1960.

### Pakistan

Treaty of friendship and commerce. Signed at Washington November 12, 1959.2 Ratification advised by the Senate: August 17, 1960.

## **United Arab Republic**

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 455; 7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), with exchange of notes. Signed at Cairo August 9. 1960. Entered into force August 9, 1960.

## DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

## Consulate General at Nicosia, Cyprus **Elevated to an Embassy**

Press release 464 dated August 16

The Department of State announced on August 16 that, concurrent with the achievement of independence by the Cypriot people and the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, the U.S. Government is extending recognition to the Government of Cyprus and elevating its consulate general at Nicosia to embassy status, effective August 16. Pending the arrival of the first American ambassador, L. Douglas Heck will act as Chargé d'Affaires.

## Resignations

Henry Cabot Lodge as U.S. Representative to the United Nations and as U.S. Representative in the Security Council, effective September 3. (For an exchange of correspondence between President Eisenhower and Ambassador Lodge, see White House press release dated August 19.)

## Designations

George M. Abbott as Deputy Director of the Foreign Service Institute, effective August 15.

ance ar omy of

Mutual

Near a

A fact

and the

Mutual

Easteri

A fact

try and

tent of

Mutual

7004. ]

A fact

ment of

nical ai

Preside

1960 5

Foreign

A pami

on the

tary's

Surplu

Agreen

force F

Radio

Behalf

Agreen

Hondu tober 2 March

Februa Grant Equipr Agreen Zealan

23, 196

Surplu Agreen

the Un

ber 24, Cairo :

Surplu

Agreer

United

29, 195

Parcel Agreer

United

zibar (

Sale o

Assura

Agreer

Zealan

change

Entere

Settler

0ther Septe

1959.

1960.

Robert L. Berenson as Director, U.S. Operations Mi sion, Libya, effective August 4. (For biographic detail see Department of State press release 428 dated Augus 4.)

J. Lampton Berry as Special Assistant to the Deput Under Secretary for Administration, effective August Theodore L. Eliot, Jr., and James C. Haahr as Special

Assistants to the Under Secretary, effective August 1. Howard Elting, Jr., as Deputy Director of Intelligence and Research, effective August 7.

Robert B. Elwood as Director, Office of Intelligence Resources and Coordination, effective August 1,

John J. Haggerty as Director, U.S. Operations Mission Greece, effective August 10. (For biographic details see Department of State press release 454 dated August Relatio 11.)

Robert F. Hale as Director of the Visa Office, effective August 15.

Owen T. Jones as Director, U.S. Operations Mission Yugoslavia, effective August 19, and as Counselor of Embassy for Economic Affairs, effective September 4. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 475 dated August 19.)

Gerson H. Lush as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Administration, effective August 15.

Robert R. Schott as Officer in Charge of Greek Affaira Bureau of Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, effective August 15.

## **PUBLICATIONS**

## Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Gov ernment Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, es cept in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Mutual Security in Action-Korea. Pub. 6975. Fu Eastern Series 91. 16 pp. 10¢.

A fact sheet summarizing U.S. assistance to the Republic of Korea and discussing the country, its economy, and government.

Foreign Consular Offices in the United States. Pub. 6982 Department and Foreign Service Series 92. 55 pp. 204

A publication containing a complete and official listing of the foreign consular offices in the United States, together with their jurisdictions and recognized personnel.

Mutual Security in Action-Laos (Revised). Pub. 6990 Far Eastern Series 92. 12 pp. 5¢.

A fact sheet outlining U.S. military and economic assist

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Not in force.

ance and discussing the country, government, and economy of Laos.

he Foreig

tions Mis

nic details

ed Augus

he Deput

August 8 as Speciai

igust 1.

1.

15.

irs, effec

7.S. Gov-

Address ents, es-

may be

75. Far

Republic

my, and

ub. 6982

op. 20¢.

isting of together

ıb. 6990

c assist-

ntelligence

s Mission

Mutual Security in Action-Iran (Revised). Pub. 6992. Near and Middle Eastern Series 54. 12 pp. 10¢.

A fact sheet describing the country, government, economy, and the U.S. military and economic assistance programs.

Mutual Security in Action—China. Pub. 6998. Far Eastern Series 93. 16 pp. 10¢.

A fact sheet giving background information on the country and discussing its economy, government, and the extent of U.S. assistance.

Mutual Security in Action—Thailand (Revised). Pub. 7004. Far Eastern Series 94. 10 pp. 10¢.

i fact sheet describing the country, trade, and government of Thailand, and the role of U.S. economic and techntelligence

President Eisenhower's Report to the Nation, May 25, 1960—Secretary Herter's Report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, May 27, 1960. Pub. 7010. General Foreign Policy Series 151. 26 pp. 15¢. ic details, ed August

e, effective Apamphlet containing the texts of the President's report on the collapse of the summit conference and the Secres Mission ary's testimony on events at the Paris summit meeting.

or of Em Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4430. 16 pp. 4. (For 10¢

ss release Agreement between the United States of America and Peru. Signed at Lima February 12, 1960. Entered into Assistant force February 12, 1960. With exchanges of notes.

Radio Communications Between Amateur Stations on k Affairs, Behalf of Third Parties. TIAS 4442. 4 pp. 5¢.

> Agreement between the United States of America and Honduras. Exchange of notes—Dated at Tegucigalpa October 26, 1959, and February 17, 1960. Entered into force March 17, 1960. With related note dated at Tegucigalpa February 19, 1960.

> Grant for Procurement of Nuclear Research and Training Equipment and Materials. TIAS 4445. 4 pp. 5¢.

> Agreement between the United States of America and New Zealand. Exchange of notes—Signed at Wellington March 23, 1960. Entered into force March 23, 1960.

> Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4446. 3 pp. 5¢. Agreement between the United States of America and the United Arab Republic, amending agreement of December 24, 1958, as amended. Exchange of notes—Signed at Cairo March 26, 1960. Entered into force March 26, 1960.

> Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4448. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the United Arab Republic, supplementing agreement of July 29, 1959. Exchange of notes-Signed at Cairo March 26, 1960. Entered into force March 26, 1960.

Parcel Post. TIAS 4449. 22 pp. 15¢

Agreement and regulations of execution between the United States of America and Zanzibar. Signed at Zanzibar October 20, 1959, and at Washington December 30, 1959. Entered into force May 1, 1960.

Sale of Military Equipment, Materials, and Services-Assurances. TIAS 4450. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and New Zealand, modifying agreement of June 19, 1952. Exchange of notes-Signed at Wellington March 25, 1960. Entered into force March 25, 1960.

Settlement of Claims of United States Nationals and Other Financial Matters. TIAS 4451. 17 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Rumania. Signed at Washington March 30, 1960. Entered into force March 30, 1960. With exchanges of notes.

Settlement of Claims of Spanish Subcontractors Arising From Construction of Military Bases. TIAS 4452, 42

Agreement between the United States of America and Spain. Exchange of notes-Signed at Madrid February 8 and 13, 1960. Entered into force February 13, 1960.

Mutual Defense Assistance—Extension of Loan of United States Vessels. TIAS 4454. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea. Exchange of notes—Signed at Seoul March 28 and April 1, 1960. Entered into force April 1, 1960.

Defense-Loan of Vessels to Argentina. TIAS 4455. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Argentina. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington March 4 and April 1, 1960. Entered into force April 1, 1960.

Interchange of Patent Rights and Technical Information for Defense Purposes—Filing of Classified Patent Applications. TIAS 4456. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Turkey. Exchange of notes—Signed at Ankara March 17 and September 16, 1959. Entered into force September

Grant for Procurement of Nuclear Research and Training Equipment and Materials. TIAS 4457. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Chile. Exchange of notes—Signed at Santiago July 23, 1959, and February 19, 1960. Entered into force February 19, 1960.

United States Educational Commission in Turkey. TIAS 4458. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Turkey, modifying the agreement of December 27, 1949, as modified. Exchange of notes—Signed at Ankara February 1, 1960. Entered into force February 1, 1960.

Guaranty of Private Investments. TIAS 4459. 8 pp. 10¢. Agreement between the United States of America and El Salvador. Signed at San Salvador January 29, 1960. Entered into force April 8, 1960.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. TIAS 4462. 7 pp.  $10\phi$ .

Proces-verbal containing schedules to be annexed to the declaration on the provisional accession of the Swiss Confederation to agreement of October 30, 1947 (Japan and Switzerland). Done at Tokyo November 13, 1959.

Tracking Stations. TIAS 4463. 8 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Spain. Exchange of notes-Signed at Madrid March 11 and 18, 1960. Entered into force March 18, 1960.

Defense-Loan of Vessel. TIAS 4464. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Colombia. Exchange of notes-Signed at Bogotá April 5 and 7, 1960. Entered into force April 7, 1960.

Defense-Weapons Production Program. TIAS 4465.

Agreement between the United States of America and Turkey. Exchange of notes-Signed at Ankara March 2, 1960. Entered into force March 2, 1960.

Tracking Stations. TIAS 4466. 9 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and

Bulletin September 5, 1960

Mexico. Exchange of notes-Signed at México April 12, 1960. Entered into force April 12, 1960.

Reciprocal Trade-Temporary Waiver of Certain Requirements of Agreement of April 8, 1943. TIAS 4467.

Agreement between the United States of America and Iran. Exchange of notes-Signed at Tehran April 12, 1960. Entered into force April 12, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4468. 5 pp. 5¢. Agreement between the United States of America and Iceland. Signed at Reykjavik April 6, 1960. Entered into force April 6, 1960. With memorandum of understand-

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4469. 4 pp. 5¢. Agreement between the United States of America and Pakistan, supplementing agreement of November 26, 1958, as amended. Signed at Karachi April 11, 1960. Entered into force April 11, 1960. With exchange of notes.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4470. 9 pp.

Agreement between the United States of America and Pakistan. Signed at Karachi April 11, 1960. Entered into force April 11, 1960. With exchange of notes.

Mutual Defense Assistance-Equipment, Materials, and Services. TIAS 4471. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Japan. Exchange of notes—Signed at Tokyo April 15, 1960. Entered into force April 15, 1960.

Defense-Weapons Production Program. TIAS 4472. 9 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Belgium. Exchange of notes-Signed at Brussels April 6 and 22, 1960. Entered into force April 22, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4473. 3 pp. 5¢. Agreement between the United States of America and Finland, supplementing and amending the agreement of March 23, 1960. Exchange of notes-Signed at Helsinki May 6, 1960. Entered into force May 6, 1960.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4474. 2 pp. 5¢. Agreement between the United States of America and Iceland, amending the agreement of March 3, 1959, as supplemented. Exchange of notes-Signed at Reykjavik May 10, 1960. Entered into force May 10, 1960.

Interchange of Patent Rights and Technical Information for Defense Purposes-Filing Classified Patent Applications. TIAS 4476. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Greece. Exchange of notes-Signed at Athens April 26, 1960. Entered into force April 26, 1960.

Guaranty of Private Investments. TIAS 4477. 5 pp. 5¢. Agreement between the United States of America and Nepal. Exchange of notes-Signed at Washington May 17. 1960. Entered into force May 17, 1960.

Oceanographic Research Station in the Turks and Caicos Islands. TIAS 4478. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, supplementing the agreement of November 27, 1956. Exchange of notes-Signed at Washington May 12, 1960. Entered into force May 12, 1960.

Oceanographic Research Stations in the Bahama Islands. TIAS 4479. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, supplementing the agreement of November 1, 197 Septeml Exchange of notes-Signed at Washington May 12, 1960 Entered into force May 12, 1960.

riculti

on Adr

order)

merical

of Dor

tion)

Congo, R

esiden

on the

enrity

Congo mmary

Troops

mgress

ngress

icy . enartm

Mutua

ha. T

ries on

yprus, l Cyprus

epartm

onsulat

an Em

esignat

Elting, Lush.

esignat

)isarma

Recom

Disarn

Intion )

ominica

of Dor

tion) .

conomi

in Volt

Educatio nounce

Arts

ermany

U.S. Rep

der Qu

S. Ur Activit

notes)

Ghana.

Greece

River

Haggerty Schott de

Immigra

Hale des

Unethica

Into U

nternat

Calendar

ings .

internati

Staten

(Herte

Italy. U

ment

Japan.

Minist

Libya.

OAS Con

Money Orders. TIAS 4480. 8 pp. 10¢.

Convention between the postal administrations of the United States of America and the Colony of British Vin gin Islands, West Indies. Signed at Road Town, Tortola British Virgin Islands, February 18, 1957, and at Wash ington March 14, 1957. Entered into force July 1, 1987.

Money Orders. TIAS 4481. 8 pp. 10¢.

Convention between the postal administrations of the United States of America and the British Colony of Montserrat, West Indies. Signed at Montserrat, Brit ish West Indies, March 15, 1957, and at Washington June 10, 1957. Entered into force September 1, 1957.

Money Orders. TIAS 4482. 7 pp. 10¢.

Convention between the postal administrations of the United States of America and the British Colony of Aptigua, West Indies. Signed at Antigua, British West Indies, December 5, 1956, and at Washington March 22 1957. Entered into force December 1, 1957.

## **Check List of Department of State** Press Releases: August 15-21

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. Releases issued prior to August 15 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 429 of August 4, 436 of August 8, 439 and 446 of August 9, 451 and 453 of August 11, 455 of August 12, and 457 of August 13.

No.	Date	Subject	
459	8/15	Dillon: Senate Foreign Relations Committee.	
*460	8/15	Martin nominated Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs (biographic details).	
461	8/15	Department statement on Francis Powers.	
462	8/15	Nuclear test talks with U.K.	
463	8/15	Herter: departure for OAS meeting at San José.	
464	8/16	Recognition of independence of Cyprus.	
465	8/16	Herter: arrival at San José.	
*466	8/17	Wilkins nominated Ambassador to Cyprus (biographic details).	
†467	8/17	Dillon: Senate Appropriations Committee.	
468	8/18	Aid to Ghana for Volta River project.	
469	8/17	Dillon: Senate Appropriations Committee.	
470	8/19	Spain credentials (rewrite).	
*471	8/19	Cultural exchange (athletic coaches for	

\*472 8/19 Passport Office moves to New State extension. 473 8/19 Herter: statement at OAS on Venezue-

1960 Olympics).

lan complaint. \*474 8/19 Air transport agreement with Mexico.

\*475 8/19 Jones designated director, USOM, Yugoslavia (biographic details).

476 8/19 Department statement on Cuba.

\*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

ns of tritish v	merican Republics. UAS Condemns Government of Dominican Republic (Herter, text of resolu-	366 355	Mutual Security Berenson designated USOM director, Libya Department Supports Request for Amendments to Mutual Security Act (Dillon) Haggerty designated USOM director, Greece Jones designated USOM director, Yugoslavia, and counselor of embassy for economic affairs	388 367 388 388
	mgo, Republic of the Pasident Welcomes Security Council Resolution on the Congo (Eisenhower) Recurity Council Considers New Difficulties in	384	North Atlantic Treaty Organization. U.S. Replies to Polish Note on German-Polish Border Question (text of note)	363
Colony rat, Br gton Ju	mmary of U.S. Support for Alrift of U.N.	384 385	Polish Border Question (text of note) Presidential Documents	363
Stort all	(angress, The (angressional Documents Relating to Foreign Pol-	373	President Amends Executive Order on Administra- tion of P.L. 480	366
s of the		367	ister Ikeda of Japan	364 384
ish We	toba. U.S. Calls Attention to Cuban Inconsistencies on Sugar Trade	360	Spain. Letters of Credence (De Yturralde y Orbegoso)	360
	Oprus, Republic of. Consulate General at Nicosia, Cyprus, Elevated to an Embassy	388	Treaty Information Current Actions	387 365
	Insulate General at Nicosia, Cyprus, Elevated to an Embassy Beignations (Abbott, Berenson, Berry, Eliot, Elting, Elwood, Haahr, Haggerty, Hale, Jones, Lush, Schott)	<b>3</b> 88	U.S.S.R. President Regrets Severity of Powers' Sentence (Hagerty, White, text of Soviet note) U.S. Urges Cessation of East German Military Activities in Berlin (texts of U.S. and Soviet	361
Office	Resignations (Lodge)	388	notes)	362
, D.C. ppear	Recommends Earliest Possible Continuation of Disarmament Negotiations (Lodge, text of reso-		cussed With U.K	360
ugust 9, 451 d 457	Intion)  Dominican Republic. OAS Condemns Government of Dominican Republic (Herter, text of resolu-	376	Current U.N. Documents Lodge resigns as U.S. Representative President Welcomes Security Council Resolution on	386 388
	tion)	355	the Congo (Eisenhower)	384
Com-	in Volta River Project	364	Congo (Lodge, text of resolution) Summary of U.S. Support for Airlift of U.N. Troops and Equipment Into Congo	384 385
etary aphic	Dounces Appointments to Advisory Committee on Arts	364	U.N. Disarmament Commission Recommends Earli- est Possible Continuation of Disarmament Nego- tiations (Lodge, text of resolution)	376
Pow-	U.S. Replies to Polish Note on German-Polish Border Question (text of note)	363	Venezuela. OAS Condemns Government of Dominican Republic (Herter, text of resolution)	355
ng at	U.S. Urges Cessation of East German Military Activities in Berlin (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes)	362	Yugoslavia. Jones designated USOM director and counselor of embassy for economic affairs	388
prus.	Ghana. U.S. Prepared To Assist Ghana in Volta River Project	364	Name Index	
Com-	Greece Haggerty designated USOM director Schott designated officer in charge of Greek affairs .	388 388	Abbott, George M	388 388 388
oject. Com-	Immigration and Naturalization Hale designated director of Visa Office Unethical Practices in Bringing Domestic Servants	388	De Yturralde y Orbegoso, Mariano Dillon, Douglas Eisenhower, President Eliot, Theodore L., Jr.	360 367
es for	Into U.S. Deplored (Hanes)	365	Elting, Howard, Jr Elwood, Robert B	388 388 388
State ezue-	International Bank Issues Year-End Financial	374	Hagerty, James C	361 388
xico.	Statement OAS Condemns Government of Dominican Republic (Herter, text of resolution)	386 355	Hale, Robert F	388 365 355
	Italy. U.S. and Italy Amend Air Transport Agreement	365	Ikeda, Hayato	364 388
	Japan. President Eisenhower Congratulates Prime Minister Ikeda of Japan (Eisenhower, Ikeda) . Libya. Berenson designated USOM director	<b>364</b> 388	Lodge, Henry Cabot       . 376, 384,         Lush, Gerson H.          Schott, Robert R.          White, Lincoln	388 388 388 <b>361</b>

ulletin



Department

State

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

WASHINGTON 25, D.C. OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AV PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300 (GPO)

## COMMUNIST ECONOMIC POLICY IN THE LESS DEVELOPED AREAS

The Communist economic offensive continued its rapid pace in 1959 and early 1960, not only reaching new levels for many of its activities but also expanding into new areas. Countries in Africa and Latin America became the focal points of major bloc efforts to establish beachheads in Western spheres of influence.

This new pamphlet, based on the most recent information available to the U.S. Government regarding the Communist program of economic penetration, brings up to date the Department of State study entitled The Communist Economic Threat, published in 1959. After an initial discussion of bloc economic policy in the less developed areas, the 38-page booklet describes the nature of the offensive, the trade drive, and the areas of concentration.

Publication 7020

20 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents Govt. Printing Office Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

(cash, check, or money order payable to Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me .... copies of Communist Economic Policy in the Less Developed Areas.

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City, Zone, and State: \_\_\_\_\_

